

THE
LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

JANUARY, 1904.

ARTICLE I.

THE RELATION OF GOD TO THE WORLD.

BY M. VALENTINE, D.D., LL.D.

Various features of the present theological disturbance seem to call for a reminder of the teachings of Christian theism on the great question of the relation of God to the world, and an inquiry into the meaning of the new representations. The new representations come prevailingly in some form of monism and shape themselves in various types of pantheistic thought. They exhibit the working of speculative evolutionist science and of the historical criticism that seeks to eliminate the supernatural from the Christian faith. The reminder may serve to suggest the revolutionary and destructive character of the ideas that are shaping the movement.

The great determinative features of Christian theism have been long fixed in the consensus of orthodox theology. The variant views, of which the history of doctrine makes mention, have been individual and exceptional. They have come into prominence by the very reason of their being peculiar and abnormal. But apart from the limited extent in which special theories on all questions find adherents, the creeds, confessions, and dogmatics of the Christian Church have presented a practically unanimous representation on this question. The view has been drawn from a careful and devout interpretation of the Sacred Scriptures, and from the soberest philosophic reasoning

"from nature up to nature's God," according to the advance in scientific knowledge of the world system and its laws. It has been determined through the fundamental truths of the absolute divine creatorship and the ends of creature welfare to which its teleology clearly points. The truth itself is fundamental to the whole Christian teaching, and of vital and vast importance to every interest of human life and conduct and the great question of human destiny. A glance at some of the different variant speculative theories which have been tentatively put forth will illustrate this importance. Dark and hopeless is the view offered by materialism, which, wholly denying a personal and purposeful Creator, bids us look on the universe as having nothing, in it or back of it, but matter and force whose blind evolutions appear in all world-forms, including the human intelligence and activity, necessarily *ending* with the end of the organization. No less gloomy and paralyzing is the view when the world is pantheistically represented as only part of the phenomena of the Absolute Being everlasting, either consciously or unconsciously, evolving and returning, forming itself differentially into all the transient forms of nature and life — nature itself being identical with God. No more inspiring is the deistic separation of God from the world, viewing Him indeed as its personal Creator, but as having constituted it that it remains self-working in its own given forces and laws, needing and receiving no immediate divine presence or care, while God lives on in some lofty empyrean above the world, without any connection with its established ongoing or any word of instruction or direction for the well-being and issues of human life. Carlyle's characterization: "An absentee God, sitting ever since the first Sabbath at the outside of the universe and seeing it go," suggests how utter an exclusion from hope and help in God may come from a false conception of His relation to the world.

But when we let the light of his creatorship in aims of love, as held in Christian theism, fall upon the question, it becomes evident that God takes a relation of most real and active goodness toward the race of spiritual beings He has made in kindred

nature, as children, for the blessedness of holy life and fellowship. His absolute self-consistency forbids any idea that His continued preservation of the world may mean abandonment of the loving interest in which he created. And unless the entire picture of the divine aim and supernatural providence drawn in the Scriptures from Genesis to Revelation is nothing but fictitious sketching of the religious imagination, God has been showing an abiding and working presence in the world, adding, after human lapse into sin, a *redeeming* movement and activity in expression of his loving concern for the welfare and happiness of man.

There can be no question that the Biblical Scriptures uniformly represent God as the real, actual, and *absolute Creator* of the world or universe—as neither identical with it nor as a mere architect forming it out of pre-existent material. Their distinctness and emphasis in this representation have given to Christian theism an everywhere recognized peculiarity of cosmological conception, always included in some form of definite statement, and for centuries, already, incorporated in dogmatic phraseology under the phrase *creatio prima*, in contradiction to the merely formative production of the cosmos from the elemental material. This primary creation of the world-elements “out of nothing,” that is, without pre-existent material, is a marked peculiarity of Biblical and Christian teaching—unknown in pagan cosmogonies, but sustained by the most thorough scientific and philosophic thought of our day. Readers may remember the conclusion of Sir John Herschell, forced on him by scientific investigation into the constitution of matter, that the very atoms of nature reveal plan and adaptions in their structure, as of “manufactured articles.” Prof. Clark Maxwell writing of these atoms, as the foundation stones of the material universe, says: “They continue this day as they were created, perfect in number and measure and weight; and from the ineffaceable characters impressed on them we learn that those aspirations after accuracy in measurement, and justice in action, which we receive among our noblest attributes as men, are ours because they are the essential qualities of Him who, in

the beginning, created not only heaven and earth but the material of which heaven and earth consist." The whole teleological proof of the existence of God, beyond rational questioning, shows matter with its powers and laws to be the product of intelligent purpose. Kant says, finely: "There is a God, because nature, even in chaos, could not proceed otherwise than with regularity and order. * * * Nature, left to its own general qualities, is rich in fruits which are always fair and perfect. Not merely are they harmonious and excellent themselves, but they are adapted to every order of being, to the use of man and to the glory of God. It is thus evident that the essential properties of matter must spring from one mind, a mind in which they belong to a solidarity of plan. All that is in reciprocal relations of harmony must be brought into unity in a single Being, from which it all depends. There is, therefore, a Being of all beings, an infinite Mind and self-sustaining wisdom, from which nature in the full range of all its forms and features derives its origin, even as regards its very possibility." Kant further declares: "The proposition that God as the universal First Cause is the cause of the existence of substance, can never be given up, without at the same time giving up the notion of God as the Being of all beings, and thereby giving up His all-sufficiency on which everything in theology depends."

If it be alleged that this teaching leaves us under the necessity of admitting as true the difficult conception of self-existent being, our reply must be that no theory of the universe, as an actual reality, has ever been suggested that obviates or can obviate this necessity. The recognition of *something* self-existent, eternal, is lodged in the necessities of rational thought and knowledge in the presence of existing being, and can be evaded only by ceasing to think. And, therefore, the affirmation of Lotze is sufficient to meet the case: "When we characterize the inner life of the personal God, the stream of His thoughts, His feelings, His will, as eternal and beginningless, as never having been in rest and impelled out of no stand-still

into motion, we exact of the imagination no greater task than is required of it by every materialistic or pantheistic view."

Biblical teaching never lets us forget the distinction between God and the world, between Deity and cosmos or realm of nature, between Creator and creature, between Maker and that which is made. Dualism, in this sense, is kept clear and unquestionable. The dividing line is impassable. God is absolute, unoriginated, eternal Being; the world, in all its atoms and aggregations, is begun existence or being, temporal and dependent. All being that is not God is a creature of God. And by every conception of the two realities, the interval between the two kinds of existence cannot cease or disappear. Absolute, unoriginated Being cannot be contingent, originated, dependent being. Originated being can never be unoriginated or absolute. This teaching runs in open, translucent certainty through the pages of the Scripture revelation. It appears in the terms in which the work of creation is given its setting. God is the self-existent Being before the heavens and the earth, giving, in independent sovereignty of love, origin to the world. The world view is that of a begun existence and dependent order. And God is not drawn in abstract terms or attributive qualities or mere ideality, as "Force" or "Law" or "Thought," "a power not ourselves," but as complete and perfect *Personality*. This point needs to be emphasized; because it is the one at which almost every form of monism breaks away from Christian theism, and which, nevertheless, is at the very core of that theism. Not only is it at the heart of the conception of God involved in the account of His creative work, but it holds, in unfailing and ever characterizing force, through the entire Biblical portraiture of His administrative and providential dealings with men till the incarnation and redemptive ministry of Christ issued in the establishment of Christianity in the world with the same conception. Outside of the authority of Bible teaching, the profoundest and best reasoned philosophic thought of the Christian centuries has ever added testimony and force to the truth and certainty of these theistic teachings of revelation. They are basal and controlling in all the leading natural evidences that

suggest and assure the divine existence; in the cosmological argument, finding an absolute self-existent Cause for the origination of the world-existence; in the teleological, constrained, from purpose evident all through nature, to postulate an intelligent and personal Creator; in the moral, reaching the same conclusion, through the further light in which the divine Personality is seen to be supreme ethical Lawgiver. Thus, from both these sources of our knowledge of God, Christian theism has always maintained these truths as essential in the necessary conception of the being of God, and has been impatient of any denial.

Theology, therefore, true to Scripture and rational data, and availing itself of all the light thrown by advancing science, has, as not only warranted but necessitated, explained the relation of God to the world or universe under two or three specifications.

First, He is *transcendent* to it. As the personal Absolute Cause it, He is *before* it and *above* it. This relation is part of the of essential truth of the principle of Causation. The Cause or creator is the logical *prius* to that which is produced.* The truth of his transcendency reverberates through the Scriptures. God is "God over all" (Rom. 5:9; Eph. 4:6). "The heaven of heavens cannot contain Him" (2 Chron. 2:6; 6:18; 1 Kings 8:27). *Secondly*, He is *immanent* in the universe. This is a direct implication of His omnipresence. He fills all things with His presence and energy. "He is not far from every one of us; for in Him we live and move and have our being" (Acts 17:27, 28). He is "through all, and in all" (Eph. 4:6). The divine

* Though this conception of cause and effect is sometimes questioned, it is nevertheless absolutely correct. It is sometimes said that a cause is such only as it works effects, and thus is only simultaneous with its effect. But a "cause" must *exist*, as the very condition of its action in the production of an effect. A cause is such, only by its power to *work* effects, and it must *be* a power in order to operate. To reduce the term to mere simultaneity is to empty it of its essential meaning and leave but a *time* relation. The essential reality in a "cause" is an existent energy for the production of that which which is not, but comes to be when the energy is exerted.

efficiency in creation was transitive and abides, not simply as an efficiency, but as personal presence. The mystery of this is enwrapped in the mystery of an infinitely complete and perfect Spirit. In a true sense God put Himself into nature—not as a *becoming nature* or an evolution and identification of substance, but a living Presence that is not nature. He is not nature, nor is nature He. It is the truth of a freely established *relation* between that which is God and Maker, and that which is not God but a creature of God. The divine will-energy, which in creation God lodged as forces in nature, and which He continues in preservation, expresses the efficiency of His abiding presence. Neither the cosmic substances nor forces could continue to exist and operate in independence of the reach and touch of that abiding will. Nature's system of law is but the order and form in which that will realize itself. "Hence the system of law itself is absolutely sensitive to the divine purpose, so that what that purpose demands finds immediate expression and realization, not in spite of the system, but in and through the system."*

But it needs to be distinctly observed, as a *third* specification, that this Christian theism does not mean that either the transcendence or the immanence is *absolute*. An absolute transcendence would involve the deistical separation of God from nature and the world, a constitution of the world as a self sustaining and self operating mechanism; and God would be simply outside and apart from it. He would be the absentee God of an utter separation; and nature and man would move on in a line of the combined working of inner tendencies and law of environment to the goal involved in their structure and place, without word or help from their Creator. An absolute immanence would involve a pantheistic dissolution of nature's movements into immediate products of God's will, and nature's activities into direct divine activity, obliterating "second causes."

This relation of God to the world, as both transcendent and immanent, gives place for both the action of "second causes,"

*Borden P. Bowne, Theism, p. 228.

or what are termed natural forces, and for special divine action in and among nature's forces and laws. On the one side it accounts for all the uniformities of nature, the reign of law or enchainment in relations of cause and effect of which science speaks, and on the other, for the reality of providential ordering of history, the reality of supernatural revelation, miracle, and whatever responses the divine will of goodness in the Infinite Father may make to His children's needs or prayers. It presents nature's existence and laws as subservient to the divine plan of love and goodness, and forever susceptible to use and direction. It recognizes, as experience and science themselves attest, the elastic character of the system, ever open to the use and service of the will-power of even human freedom, and much more fully to the touch of God for the accomplishment of the supreme moral and spiritual purpose in respect to man for which our physical earth exists. As God is before nature, above it, in it, under it and through it, without being a part of it, as its forces and laws are but the modes of His will for its preservation, we must think of Him as, through His omnipresence, abiding forever *free* for all the special providential causation which his wisdom may see needful, and choose for the consummation of his purposes of love. This theism thus opens to view a nature-constitution also that fits *man's* endowments and position as an intelligent moral agent, whose religious instincts call for fellowship with God, as they carry a sense of responsibility to Him, whose true life and blessedness are dependent on ethical conformity to the divine holiness and love, and who, as the life of the world shows, greatly needs divine instruction and direction for his right welfare and proper destiny.

But we must turn to the evolutionistic monism, the propaganda of which has for some time been peculiarly aggressive. This breaks with the long consensus of the Church's Biblical and rational theism, and in its leading representatives vacates all these fundamental adaptations to the religious nature and spiritual needs of man, which that theistic view has profoundly met and satisfied, in the faith and experience of believers through the Christian centuries. If continued and pressed to

the logic of both its negations and affirmations, it threatens to become a most revolutionary and destructive movement. It is impossible to feel that this is a part of genuine development or fuller understanding and application of Christianity to advancing conditions, still loyal to and proceeding upon its Scriptural, historic and essential content. Its breaks are too basal and vital; and the movement marks its import too significantly in an arbitrary Biblical Criticism which provides for the laying of other Scriptural foundations for reconstructing the fundamental view. The view itself, as being shaped and pressed by its leaders, has in it the logic of a practical surrender of historic Christianity. It still calls itself by the old name, but, noting the eliminations it makes and the enrichments *it claims* to afford, it, in its prevailing presentations, seems to be only a naturalistic religion, constructed in the name of science and postulates of evolutionist speculative thought, supported sometimes by researches and ideas which comparative theology is opening in the theosophies and religions of the pagan orient.

This monistic view of God and the world which is claimed to be demanded by scientific thought and its modern insight into nature's forces and modes, is a product of evolutionist speculation. The Darwinian theory of evolution does not indeed necessarily involve either atheistic materialism or any pantheistic conception of the world. There are many scientists, philosophers, and theologians who adopt the substance of Darwin's evolutionary theory, who are Christian theists in the sense in which Christian theism has been outlined. It is possible to think of evolution simply as the *mode* of God's free and absolute creation of the universe. But the Darwinian theory, in its surprisingly wide acceptance, has been the occasion of pressing forward the evolution idea under pantheistic type and identifying the natural and the divine as one and the same in essential being. The forerunners of the movement are found in the idealistic philosophies of Spinoza, Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel. "Spinoza more nearly represents the modern point of view than does any eighteenth century theologian, orthodox or deistic," says the professor of Philosophy and History of Religion in the

Union Theological Seminary, New York.* The monistic view is shaped in various types of representation. While in all of them the distinction between God and the world is still verbally continued, the different types agree in asserting that, in reality, God and the world are only two aspects of one and the same being or substance. Their basal assertion is not of a "relation" between God and nature, but an affirmation of their substantial identity, as but different manifestations or forms of the One Absolute Existence that is at once and forever the "One and the All." The movement has its roots in the idealistic philosophy of Germany, but has been quickened in the general atmosphere of evolutionist science and has developed a new metaphysic or ontology. The diversity of forms in which its supporters set it forth is suggestive not only of the difficulty of the problem but especially of the uncertainty of the offered solution.

In the *American Journal of Theology* for July, 1901, Prof. R. M. Wenley, of the University of Michigan, has sympathetically outlined the movement, from its Germanic beginnings, in its transition and spread in Britain. He marks its progress in three stages. "First came the discovery of the Hegelian system and appreciation of its vast importance." He names here Dr. Jas. Hutchinson Stirling and the late Professor Wallace. "A second outgrowth followed, the result mainly of the demands made upon the leading idealists in their situation as academic teachers. A new reading of the history of philosophy, an interpretation of the origins of idealism itself, and a critico-constructive reaction upon the fundamental positions of the traditional British standpoint, were the consequence." Here he mentions Dr. Edward Caird's first work on *Kant*, the late T. H. Green's destructive distillation of Locke, Berkeley, and Hume, and Prof. Adamson's Lectures on *Kant*, and also the academic teaching of Dr. E. Caird, T. H. Green and Wallace, at Glasgow and Oxford. A third stage was reached in the late seventies, which he calls "the period of discipleship," which is

* Dr. Knox, *The Direct and Fundamental Proofs of the Christian Religion*, p. 19.

explained as a fellowship of defense and propagation of the new views. The two brothers, John and Edward Caird, the first a clergyman and professor in the University of Glasgow, the second a layman and professor first at Glasgow and later at Oxford, men of fine intellectual endowments and culture, especially for speculative thought, are credited with being the chief and most influential representatives of the movement. Prof. Wenley adds a list of British authors and teachers (with their works), who have been influenced by it positively or negatively, or who have contributed to its extension. The list, including some men of British university training who have taught in America, is a surprisingly long one, and suggests the prevalence that must result from the continuous teaching of so many conspicuous educators, authors of books, and writers for periodicals, in their zeal for advanced learning, in so many and prominent educational centers, and carried thence through numberless channels to the minds of the people. The writer from whom we are drawing, quotes from a criticism, by Prof. Iverach, of Aberdeen, of John Caird's *Fundamental Ideas of Christianity*, some sentences intended to describe the effect of the work of the two Cairds: "What student of philosophy is there that has not fallen under their influence? Nay, whether students of philosophy or not, few men of our generation have escaped their influence. It has spread far and wide, has permeated art, science, literature, and theology. Owing very much to them, idealism has become the dominant philosophy in England, Scotland and America. When they began their work it needed courage for a man to profess to be an idealist, now it takes some courage to profess anything else. Idealism has captured most of the philosophic chairs of our Scottish universities, and its familiar phraseology is heard in our sermons." This representation is, doubtless, somewhat overdrawn, but may be taken as a magnified picturing of a really large movement.

As to its measure in the United States, we have not tried to form a list of its representative advocates, or to obtain statistics as to the extent to which it has found acceptance. But any one who has been taking intelligent note of what has been go-

ing on in our educational centers, in different universities, colleges, and theological seminaries, in the press's output of scientific theory, speculative philosophy, comparative history of religion, theology, and even general literature, cannot have failed to see the change that has taken place along this line. It comes to us in rapidly appearing volumes. Several journals of wide circulation are specifically devoted to its propagation. It is taught in the lecture-rooms where education is giving direction to thought, is heard in sermons to the people, and echoing through our poetry. Indeed, it has become incontestable that this philosophy is very largely a poetical product, the work of the imagination in visionary creative action, constructing in images of fantasy. Some of its advocates admit and even claim this as the way of deepest insight into the hidden mysteries of the world and God. Prof. E. Caird treats with favor Goethe's finding a "universe" in the "inner life" whose ideals may be "revelations" truer than history and containing the divine. Dr. Macdonald, in lectures to the students of King's College, London, maintains that the "poetical method is itself a natural law, and can never be unscientific," and says that "the poet often feels, and hence in some measure understands, the uniformity of nature in simplicity of law which is withheld from the experience and intelligence of the philosopher."

Sometimes this evolutionist monistic teaching designates itself "ethical monism," and asks belief and favor on the ground, conceded by all, that man, in his moral constitution, shares ethical qualities or attributes with God—though it is surreptitiously made to pass into a monism of essence by a representation that "finite spirits are circumscriptions of the divine substance."* Sometimes it names itself "idealistic monism," carefully avoiding use of the terms "substance" or "essence," picturing the world or universe in abstract terms, as only a thought-existence, a self-evolution of "idea," "law," "force," "purpose," or "absolute thought," disregarding the fact that these and other abstractions have in themselves no objective existence, but ex-

* Dr. A. H. Strong's *Christ and Creation or Ethical Monism*.

ist for ourselves only as we create them, and that the necessary presupposition for an idea, thought, purpose, etc., is a Thinker, and the order can only be, not that abstract thought evolves into the Thinker, but a Thinker develops these abstract ideas. Sometimes monism has been shaped in materialism—an evolution of matter in motion producing the world of nature and man. The absurdities of this view, however, have, these late years, been so thoroughly exposed as to leave it with little or no following among men of intelligence or philosophic learning.

We discover the revolutionary and destructive import of this monistic and pantheistic movement by looking specifically at some of its bearings. That it is in itself a thorough transformation of the traditional conception of God and the world, is not only conceded by its advocates, but claimed as its merit and reason for preference. We need, therefore, to look at its bearing on other truths that are fundamental and vital in the system of Christianity, as its nineteen centuries have known and understood this.

1. It shadows out of sight, if it does not fully vacate, the personality of God. It matters not that this is disclaimed by some. The fact remains. The Absolute Personal Being disappears—dissolved into abstractions, "law," "life," "consciousness," "force," "purpose," "tendency," "the Absolute," etc., some inscrutably transcendent principle, the product of the human idealizing faculty or imagination, all words of swelling sound, but empty of concrete essence or being. They do not bring a personal God into view. They leave Him without affirmation. As we know personality, or are able to conceive of it, it is marked and distinguished by self-consciousness, intelligence and self-determination in freedom. But these attributes express functions or activities—not concrete or personal being. The illogical vice of employing these abstract terms as designatives in this connection results in causing the reader's mind to rest upon them, without reaching a personal Creator or God. The evolutionary power and process are continually attributed to pure "will," "unconscious intelligence," "impersonal reason," "uni-

versal life," etc. But these expressions are but phrases, formed by abstraction, that themselves are made to take the place and do the work of God.

This shadowing away—not to say positive denial—of the divine personality, must at once change, if it does not annul, the Christian conception of man's relation to the personal love of God. Any view that does not clothe the thought of God in the strong light of such love, that resolves his love into an impersonal principle of goodness in the absolute world-ground, reaching all world-existence, especially man, in the absolutely eternal necessary self-evolution in which men have their being as temporal parts of the eternal One, must greatly and seriously alter the Christian sense of relation to the love of the heavenly Father. This evolutionary monism, being held, as it almost always is, as excluding any divine transcendence in the sense of supernatural action or manifestation, darkens away the adaptations of the Christian truth of the divine love by leaving no way or channel of touch for our help other than the evolutionary movement in nature as it is locked up in the unbroken relation of natural cause and effect. Though the theory, in phrase, seems to bring God very close to us, *in us* and *identical* in essence with us, yet in reality it does not allow us to contemplate His love as ever free and ready with special help to meet the needs and answer the prayers of His human children amid the ever-recurring contingencies of life, or act at all in any way or line of special providential direction or aid. The absentee God of deism could not more effectually dissolve the hope for any divine help other than that which the course of nature is eternally set to afford us.

2. But this first effect of monism, the confusion or obliteration of the personality of God and the consequent changing of the Scriptural view of the ever free readiness of the divine love to human needs and response to prayer, has thus already brought to view another great truth fundamentally included in Christian teaching, the truth of God's *supernatural Presence and action in the world*. It is instructive to recall and remember the fact that the development and acceptance of the evolutionist hypothesis

in its various forms, whether constructed on the basis of materialism, spiritual theism, or idealistic monism, have been attended with a rapid repudiation of the miraculous in the Scriptures and the sinking of Christianity to a place alongside of the other historic religions as but products of the religious nature of man. The anti-supernaturalistic type of the Higher Criticism finds its roots in this evolutionism, applying its principle to human life, society, and history. The conception of a supernatural revelation, along with its recorded miracles, is discarded. The idea of "revelation" is to it no longer a movement of God in self-disclosure and truth to man, a communication or instruction in addition to His self-manifestation in creation and through nature, but a movement and progress of man, by virtue of his religious nature and search, finding out God and the verities in the relation of men to Him. Christianity is an evolution of the religious aptitudes lodged in the human constitution—a human evolution moving on and carrying forward the divine aim or "intent" in the nature-evolution which prepared the world for man. The monistic or pantheistic evolution carries the divine into the human personality, and from this point "revelation" is evolved. But as to "miracle" or the "supernatural" as something beyond the revealment read from the human side in the cosmic and human constitution, this evolution will have none of it. The elder Caird recognizes that monism can concede the Christian revelation as "supernatural" only in this evolutionary sense of the *divine in man* reaching disclosure in advancing human thought and discovery.* The younger Caird represents belief in the miraculous by the apostles and early Church as a remnant of Old Testament misconceptions and part of the tribute which had to be paid to Judaism, by reason of only partial apprehension of the spiritual nature of Christianity.† That belief was in the atmosphere, and "the Jews could scarcely receive the idea of a moral regeneration of man's life, except as the accompaniment, or even the effect, of a sudden divine interfer-

* *Philosophy of Religion*, pp. 339-343.

† *Evolution of Religion*, vol. II, pp. 234-236.

ence with the course of nature, by a Messiah who was exempt from all its laws." To illustrate St. Paul's remaining bondage to his Jewish creed, the Oxford professor mentions that despite the apostle's effort to enter fully into the spiritual meaning of Christianity, "he admitted one transcendent miracle [the resurrection of Jesus] as the basis of his faith, and expected another transcendent miracle to cut short" the Messianic agency. It is needless to quote from others. Every reader of the discussion of the the problems of religion and revelation, these recent years, knows that this evolutionism, whether in monism or the extreme higher criticism, has characterized itself in rejection of supernaturalism in the sense of any transcendence of the natural development of the world and man.

3. This leads to a further change of the Christian view—abandonment of Christianity's claim to be *redemptive* in its import and action. It claims to be more than a revelation of truth to help the evolution of men and social humanity. It stands in relation to man as lapsed into sin, in its bondage and guilt. It offers itself as showing and affording the way of forgiveness and renewal into the true life. The *supernaturalism* of Christianity has relation to this lapse and bondage in sin. The *creational* action of God constituted nature, and created man with endowments and conditions for a blessed life and destiny of fellowship with God, as "made in His image." We may assume that had not man corrupted his nature by abuse of his freedom the natural provision would have sufficed for his welfare and destiny. But the same free Love that created, and by so doing established nature's order, also freely, when the human need of salvation came, met it in a *super-natural* and redemptive administration, to make recovery and attainment of right destiny possible. And the note of *redemptive* recovery of man sounds through all the Scriptures, as records of a Providential movement revealing and establishing a redemptive economy. From the horrible reality and bondage of sin, with its misery-creating disorder, monism, in its rejection of the Christian truth of a supernatural administration and activity in the world, offers no redemptive provision, but sets men to ethical self-culture of

their own competent "divine humanity." The ethical evolution is to bring the individual consciousness of men into realization of their oneness with God.

4. The conception of *sin* must also be changed. Christian doctrine views sin as intrinsically evil, something that "ought not" to be, a breach of duty to God or to men, deserving and drawing the Divine displeasure. But monism teaches that men are parts of the One Absolute Being eternally and everywhere self-identical, at once God in man and Man in God, and holds that the world-system or order is eternally God's own by self-evolution. In this view that which we call sin must either belong to God or be but an appearance. How can that which is of the very substance of God sin or become immoral? Prof. Royce explains: "As the Absolute is identically our whole Will expressed, our experience brought to finality, our life individuated, so on the other hand we are the divine, we are the divine as it expresses itself here and now; and no item of what we are is other than an occurrence within the whole of the divine existence."* There can be no real separation or diremption of the divine in man from the divine in God. And so sin is explained in corresponding definitions—"finiteness, limitation of knowledge," "blindness or imperfection of insight," "inattention," "narrowness," and failure thus to bring the meaning of the Divine Will in individual selves into true harmony with the Absolute Will; acting sometimes in actual strife with this Will, in oneness and full harmony with which are to be realized the goal of life and the supreme good. As thus explained sin becomes simply "good in the making," or "the soul of goodness in things evil."† Surely this transient phase of "finite knowledge," "limited insight," "inadequate attention," "narrowness," and consequent unethical striving in individual parts of the Absolute or Godhead, is something far different from the idea of sin in the Biblical view as free disobedience of men to their infinitely holy, good and loving Creator and rightful Ruler.

* *The World and the Individual*, p. 408.

† Prof. Royce, *The World and the Individual*, pp. 347-360.

whose plea is "O do not that abominable thing which I hate," and whose goodness seeks the overthrow of the evil and recovery from its ruin through a divine self-sacrifice in redemptory provision.

5. The monistic view changes and practically rejects the Christian truth of the *incarnation* and the *Person of Christ*. Though it might seem to offer a solution of the mystery of a divine incarnation in the Person of Christ, it denies it in its Scripture and Christian sense. It seems easy, on this pantheistic theory, to think that in Him there was reached the full consciousness of identity with God, and that thus He was among men a true revelation of God and a type of the perfect Man. He might seem to be an adequate and authoritative teacher of the things of God, while at the same time the pattern of the perfection of humanity. But this is not the sense in which the Christian view and faith have understood the truth from first till now. When monism speaks of the divinity of Christ it means only that He is divine in the same way as *all* men are divine in their measure with different degrees of consciousness of the fact. The voluntary incarnation of Him who in the beginning was God, but took on Him the form of a servant and was made **in** the likeness of man, "God manifest in the flesh," a Saviour who is God, with all the attributes of God, disappears in a human Saviour in whom evolution has exalted the common God-consciousness of humanity into unique degree. Evolutionist monism calls for a complete transformation of the Christian doctrine of the Person of Christ.

6. The metamorphosis of truth heretofore held as essential and vital in Christianity extends to many other doctrines. The doctrine of *prayer*, as having, under a divine supernatural administration and its providential significance, efficacy, not simply as a subjective exercise, a self strengthening and self developing force, but as objectively reaching God above us and securing actual response according to His supreme wisdom and will, is rejected and lost in the haze in which pantheistic representation hides away the truth of the personality and loving fatherhood of God. The idea of *faith* is changed from its being the ap-

prehension and appropriation of the redemptive grace of God in our Lord Jesus Christ, provided through His propitiation and righteousness, into ethical aspiration and confidence in the perfect monistic evolution to carry individual divineness into realization of its oneness with the Absolute. The ground or standard of the *moral law* is transferred from its basis in the eternal and unchangeable nature and will of God to the principle of utility or 'worth judgments' developed by progressive unfoldment of the meaning of human aspirations. The truth of *freedom*, or self-determination in human personality, is submerged in the necessary evolution of 'The Infinite' which has been put in the place of a personal God. Despite the effort of some monists to save the Absolute Divinity from identification with necessity or fate, the logic of displacing the personality of God means determinism or fate as the fact for both God and man.* The impersonal cannot be the parentage of personal freedom. The Christian doctrine of the *resurrection of the body*, so distinctly declared by Christ and the Apostles and resounding through the Church's worship in the Apostles' Creed, is discarded because of its miraculous import, or resolved into the different truth of the rising or ascent of the soul into a higher stage of life when the body dies. The tendency to this shows itself widely in the new evolutionist trend. The doctrine of the *personal immortality* of the soul is being displaced by some who substitute the immortality of the race or abstract humanity, the elevation and perfecting of which is the intent or goal of evolution. Though a metaphysic for the personal immortality of the individual is constructed by some monists, as by Prof. Royce,† the more direct logic of evolutionism is the passing of the individual in the onward movement of the life of the race. And we hear notes of teaching that we should accept the situation, satisfied to have our temporal existence used in contributing to the race-perfection.

All these changes and transformations, and others that might

* So Dr. Schurman in *Andover Lectures*, pp. 173-178. So also Dr. Hill, *Genetic Philosophy*, p. 334.

† *The World and the Individual*, pp. 431-446.

be pointed out, surely justify the assertion that this monistic movement is revolutionary and destructive. It is not progress and enrichment, by recent knowledge, upon the basis of the old truth. When we look at the offered reconstruction, comprehensively and analytically, a reconstruction in which the old truths have disappeared or present altered face and meaning, we are not surprised to hear its most prominent protagonist, at Oxford, call it a "*new Christianity*."^{*} But "new religion" would seem a fitter designation, in view of the incongruity of using the name of Christ to designate a speculative religious theory, departing in so many and vital points from His clear teaching as given in the historic records of it, and interpreted and developed by His apostles under the promised guidance of His Spirit.

This paper, as will be observed, is not an argument or effort to exhibit direct disproofs of the monistic theory. It may be said that if it is essentially true we should accept it with all its consequences. Emphasis is often laid on the duty and safety of following the truth wherever it leads. But the consequences of acceptance of theoretic views are in themselves just criteria of truth. This principle applies with mighty force here. If the consequences of the new theory have been fairly indicated, they are reasons for rejection of its claims to truth. If the Christian teaching that has for nineteen centuries held the mind and heart of Christendom, and met the spiritual needs of men, even in periods when some alien elements and perversions impaired it, is threatened with such loss of its constructive foundations or vital truths, or such emptying of these truths of their original and organic meaning, we ought to take this as an emphatic suggestion that the movement is not one of truth but of error, and to halt before accepting it.

* *The Evolution of Religion*, by Edward Caird, ii., p. 322.

ARTICLE II.

THE LUTHERAN PREDESTINATION CONTROVERSY.

BY PROFESSOR J. W. RICHARD, D.D., LL.D.

The Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo., has sent to THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY a pamphlet of forty-eight pages, bearing the following title: *Die Grunddifferenz in der Lehre von der Bekhrung und Gnadenwahl. Vortrag, gehalten vor der freien Conferenz zu Watertown, Wis., am 29 April, 1903. Von F. Pieper. Nebst einem Appell an alle Lutheraner die sich über den Lehrstreit in der americanisch-Lutherischen Kirche ein Urtheil bilden wollen.* That is: "The fundamental difference in the Doctrine of Conversion and Predestination. A Lecture delivered before the 'free conference' at Watertown, Wis., April 29th, 1903, by F. Pieper. Also an Appeal to all Lutherans who would form a Judgment on the Doctrinal Controversy in the American Lutheran Church."

No one can deny that there has been a great deal of theological *polemic* in the American Lutheran Church during the last fifty years. For the most part the strife has centered round a few fundamental principles, and consequently has been divisive in its nature. The evil that has resulted from the strife will pass away. The good will abide. There can be no doubt that the Lutheran Church in America, as a whole, understands itself better today than it has ever done before. The controversies through which it has passed have been educative. Theological teachers and pastors have learned more highly to appreciate the depth, the fullness and the reasonableness of the Lutheran faith. They have also learned, and are learning, to exercise a broader and more generous charity for each other, based in part at least on the discovery that Lutheran theologians and teachers have not always seen eye to eye in regard to all the doctrines believed to be taught in the divine word, and have not always

agreed to state those doctrines in forms of words that mean the same thing. Moreover, recent researches among the *origines* of Lutheran history have brought out facts that modify not a little some traditional conceptions. The consequence is that as the horizon has broadened, so men have broadened with it. As a Church we do not stand, and cannot stand, exactly where we once stood, or at least thought we stood. The ground under our feet is still the foundation of the prophets and apostles, but the parallax has diminished, because the point of view has changed.

Tempora mutantur et nos in illis mutamur. The Lutheran Church in this country seems to have entered on an era of *Irenic*. Free conferences are the order of the day. The object set before such conferences is the removal of differences of view in regard to important doctrines taught, or supposed to be taught, by the Lutheran Church as such, and the bringing about of a better understanding between, and perhaps the union of, some of the separated bodies bearing the same name, and claiming the same paternity. Such an object, provided it be not attended by the sacrifice of conviction and of principle, and be not promoted by a sentimental desire to have "one great Lutheran Church," ought to excite the sympathy of all who breathe the Saviour's prayer that his followers may all be *one*, as he is in the Father, and the Father is in him.

The *Lecture* before us charity compels us to interpret in the light of the foregoing observations. It is firm in principle, that is, in the inculcation of what its author affirms to be "the position of the entire Synodical Conference and especially also of the Missouri Synod" (p. 29), but it is *irenic* in tone and temper, and in this respect it contrasts commendably with much of the polemic literature on the same subject that proceeded from the pen of the late Dr. Walther, Professor Pieper's predecessor in the chair of dogmatic theology in the chief theological seminary of the Missourians. It purposely avoids all reference to the writings of the Missourians and their opponents on the subject of Predestination, and discusses "the separating anti-

thesis" from the standpoint of certain doctrinal propositions of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

PROFESSOR PIEPER'S METHOD.

The question which Professor Pieper tries to answer is this: "Why are not *all* men converted and saved, or more accurately expressed: Why are *some* men *rather than others* converted and saved, since the grace of God in Christ is general, and since all men are alike in the same condition of depravity?" Or: "Cur alii prae alii?" After adverting to the fact that this question has been the *crux theologorum* of all ages, and that it has divided, "the so called confessional Lutherans" of America, Professor Pieper quotes that rock of offence to all rigid adherents of Article II, of the Form of Concord, viz., Melanchthon's celebrated passage about Free-will, the *liberum arbitrium*. But he quotes it just as all who differ with Melanchthon are in the habit of quoting it; that is, he gives so much of it as suits his purpose: "Cum promissio sit universalis, nec sint in Deo contradictoriae voluntates, necesse est, in nobis, esse aliquam discriminis causam, cur Saul abiciatur, David recipiatur, id est, aliquam esse actionem dissimilem in his duobus;" and in like isolation, following the Form of Concord itself, that other passage from the same author: "Liberum arbitrium est facultas applicandi se ad gratiam."

This method of excerpting does the great Preceptor essential injustice. He should have the credit and the benefit of all that he has written on this difficult subject of the Will in its relation to the word and work of God in the matter of man's salvation. Melanchthon himself is known to have protested against such a method of quoting one of these very passages. Dr. Jacob Runge, an unimpeachable witness, wrote to Jacob Andreae, one of the authors of the Form of Concord, May 29th, 1584, as follows: "You yourself remember, when at Worms in 1557 Master Philip was asked by Master Brentz, whether he spoke of man as regenerate or as unregenerate, when he said liberum arbitrium esse facultatem applicandi se

ad gratiam, that he begged that the three preceding lines in the context of the *Loci Communes*, be considered, viz: *Scito velle Deum hoc ipso modo nos convertere, cum promissione excitati luctamur nobiscum, invocamus et repugnamus diffidentiae nostrae et vitiosis affectibus.*" To which Dr. Runge very pertinently adds: "It is easy to determine whether such things can exist and take place in an unregenerate man."

We now quote the entire paragraph, together with the three lines of context, that the words in question may be understood as Melanchthon begged that they should be: "Know thou that God wills to convert us in this very way, when, having been moved by the promise, we strive with ourselves, pray and resist our distrust and other evil affections.

"Therefore some ancients have thus spoken: Free will in man is the faculty by which he applies himself to grace; that is, hears the promises, strives to assent, and abandons sins against conscience. Such things do not take place in devils. Therefore the difference between devils and the human race should be considered. These things will become clearer when the promise is considered. Since the promise is general, and since there are not contradictory wills in God, it is necessary that there be some cause of the difference as to why a Saul is rejected and a David is accepted, that is, it is necessary that there be some different action in these two. These things rightly understood are true, and practice in the exercises of faith and in the true consolation, when minds rest on the Son of God as set forth in the promise, will illustrate this union of causes, viz., of the word of God, of the Holy Spirit, and of the Will."^{*}

But let us include more of the context, not in isolated excerpts, but in full paragraphs: "Moreover it must be known that the Holy Spirit operates through the word of the Gospel heard, or made the subject of meditation, as is said in Galatians, 3:14: That we may receive the promise of the Spirit by faith.

* This quotation is taken from the *Loci* of the third period, 1543-1559. C. R. 21, p. 659. The passage: *Liberum arbitrium in homine facultatem esse applicandi se ad gratiam*, first appeared in the edition of 1548. But "the three causes" first appeared in the edition of 1543.

And often has it been said that those who meditate concerning God ought to begin with the word of God, and ought not to seek God without the word. When we begin with the word, here concur the three causes of a good action, the word of God, the Holy Spirit and the human will assenting to, and not opposing, the word of God. For it is able to cast it off, as Saul cast it off by his own will, but when the mind hears and gives heed, and does not resist, and does not yield to doubt, but by the assistance of the Holy Spirit tries to assent, in this struggle the will is not inert.

"The ancients have said that when grace precedes and the will follows, good works are done. Thus Basil says: 'Only will, and God anticipates.' God precedes us, calls, moves, assists, but let us take care not to resist. For it is evident that sin arises in us, not in the will of God. Chrysostom says: 'But he who draws, draws him that is willing.' So also in this very passage of John it is said: Every man therefore that hath heard, and learned of the Father, cometh unto me. He commands to learn, to hear the word, and not to resist, but to assent to the word of God, and not to yield to doubt."

These fuller quotations present Melanchthon's doctrine of the will and of the *three concurring causes* in a light very different from that in which it is exhibited by Professor Pieper and by those who, like him, seek to down Melanchthon by appealing to the Form of Concord, of which the Professor says: "The position of the Form of Concord, must be accepted by the theology of *all times*, if it would make good its claim of being a scriptural theology," p. 13.

It is to be observed that Melanchthon says that the Holy Spirit operates through the word of the Gospel, when that word is heard and is made the subject of meditation; that we must begin with the word of God; that grace must precede before the will can act to do good works. Nowhere is it admitted in sound Lutheran teaching that the Holy Spirit operates otherwise than through the word of God; and equally is it in accord with sound Lutheran teaching that man has the ability to hear and to meditate on the word of God. Moreover, it is a Lutheran doctrine

that there is a divine potency active in the word of God. It illuminates the understanding; it appeals to the heart and conscience of man. He who hears it is not in a state of pure nature. A new religious and moral factor has come before him. He is no longer wholly without excuse. But in addition the Holy Ghost comes and shows the meaning of the divine word, and by that subtle but powerful influence exerted by spirit upon spirit, excites the mind. In a word grace *precedes*. It is nowhere the teaching of Melanchthon that the will of man takes the *initiative* in the work of salvation. In these *Loci*, in the context of the paragraphs now under review, he says: "The carnal man perceives not the things that are of the Spirit of God, that is, he does not really know that God is angry with sin; he does not know the anger; he does not really know God, as David, when committing adultery, did not yet know the anger of God, but afterwards knew it when he was again quickened by the Holy Spirit. But Saul turned away from God, did not call on him, determined not to be assisted by God, did not confide in God." Here comes in the *aliqua actio dissimilis* of which Melanchthon speaks. David acted in one way with reference to the word of God, and Saul in quite a different way. God treated both as personalities, as active, responsible agents, not as passive subjects. Where is the record that denies that there was "some cause of the difference" residing in or proceeding from the two men? It is not said that the one was elected, and the other was reprobated, or that the one was effectually called, and the other ineffectually, that is, without sufficient grace or assistance from the Holy Ghost. The one inquired of a woman that had a familiar spirit, and obeyed not the voice of the Lord. The other said: "I have sinned against the Lord." Perhaps no one ever stated the essence of the case better than Melanchthon has done in the context of which we have been speaking: "The madness of the Manichaeans must not be allowed. They imagine that there is a certain number of persons whom they call 'υλικούς καὶ Χοίκους, who are not able to be converted. Conversion did not take place in David as a stone is converted into a fig tree. But the Free-will in David

does something. When he heard the rebuke and the promise, he volens jam et libere confesses his fault. His will (voluntas) does something when it gives attention to this word: The Lord hath taken away thy sin. And when he strives to pay attention to this word, then he is assisted by the Holy Spirit, as Paul says, Rom. 1:19: The gospel is the power of God unto salvation to him who does not resist, that is, does not despise the promise, but assents to and believes it. And again, the Gospel is the ministry of the Spirit. Also: That we may receive the promise of the Spirit."

There is no Pelagianism in this passage, nor indeed in anything that Melanchthon ever wrote. Pelagius begins with the human will, and seems to be unconscious of the fact that morality has its roots in religion. Melanchthon invariably begins with the word of God: *Ordinatur a verbo*, and with the Holy Spirit: *Adjuvante etiam Spiritu Sancto*, and with precedent grace: *Praecedente gratia, comitante voluntate*. "This sentiment must be maintained and is true: The human will is not able without the Holy Spirit to produce the spiritual affections which God requires, viz., the true fear of God, true confidence in the mercy of God, the true love of God." "But God instituted the ministry that the word might be received, that the mind might meditate on and embrace the promise; and while we resist unbelief, the Holy Spirit is at the same time active in us.

"Therefore, to those who excuse their inactivity because they think that Free-will does nothing, I reply: On the contrary it is God's eternal and unchanging command, that you should obey the voice of the Gospel, should hear the Son of God, should acknowledge the Mediator. How terrible a sin it is not to be willing to behold the Son of God, the Mediator given to the human race! I cannot, you say. Yea, in some manner you can, and when by the voice of the Gospel you console yourself that you are assisted by God called upon in prayer, know also that the Holy Spirit is active in that consolation. Know that God in this very manner wills to convert us, when, quickened by the promise, we strive with ourselves, pray, and resist our unbelief and other vicious affections."

Thus in every instance Melanchthon comes back to the point that conversion *begins* with God and is carried forward by the *active agency* of the Holy Spirit. In a word, grace *always* precedes. The will becomes active only under excitation from above. Without such excitation "human nature is oppressed by sin and death, and the magnitude of this evil condition cannot be comprehended by the human judgment, but is seen in the revealed word of God." It is Christ "who takes away sin and death and restores human nature. I have now spoken of the chief evils, which human nature cannot remove. In so far therefore is the will captive, not free, namely, to remove the depravity of nature and death." In not a solitary instance does Melanchthon represent human nature, or any action of the will, as a *causa meritoria* of salvation. The promise extends to all men, but salvation is by grace alone. That all men are not saved, not God, but man, is the cause, and in this conclusion Melanchthon harmonizes perfectly with Luther, who says: "If God does not will death, it must be imputed to our will that we perish, for he wills that all men be saved, inasmuch as by the word of salvation he comes to all, and it is the fault of the will, which does not admit him. * * *Volui et tu noluisti.*"*

These long quotations from the great Preceptor must certainly make an impression on the reader very different from that made by the brief excerpts torn from their context by Professor Pieper. And yet we scarcely think that we have done Melanchthon full justice, for the reason that we have not quoted enough. We have really not told what Melanchthon means by *De Humanis Viribus sue Libero Arbitrio* with which he heads that chapter of his *Loci* from which all of our quotations have been taken. *De Humanis Viribus*, literally translated into English, is, *Of the Human Powers*. But this is ambiguous, and may have reference to the physical, or to the intellectual, or to the moral powers. The *De Libero Arbitrio* finds a literal translation in, *Of Free Will*. But this is not ade-

* Erl. Ed. Op. Lat. Var. Arg. VII, 222-8.

quate, neither is the compound word Free-will, by which we have uniformly translated it, adequate. Neither is *Liberum Arbitrium* identical with *Voluntas*, as the power or faculty of the human soul for choices, the self determining activity and essential freedom of which are denied only by fatalists. We must fall back upon Melanchthon's own definition as given in these *Loci*: "Mind and Will (*Voluntas*) conjoined are the liberum arbitrium. Or liberum arbitrium is called the faculty of the will for choosing or seeking those things which have been made known, and for rejecting the same, which faculty in the uncorrupted nature was far more glorious; now it is manifoldly impeded, as we shall show later. But now I explain the word in the most general way. It was of the liberum arbitrium that Fabricius refused to accept the gold offered by Pyrrhus, or that Antigonus refused to look at the offered head of the slain Pyrrhus. But in the speech of prophets and apostles are the words Mind and Heart, both of which are used for the intellect and the will truly and not seemingly willing something; that is, they contemplate the judgment and real, not seeming, appetites, nor an external work only."

Now, according to the teaching of Melanchthon the liberum arbitrium can know and do the things appertaining to this life, and this is shown by the references to Fabricius and Antigonus. But he nowhere says that this liberum arbitrium (mind and will conjoined) can know or love God, or can of itself apply itself to Grace. On the contrary in the edition of the *Loci* of 1543 he says expressly: "In regard to the liberum arbitrium we must know that men cannot satisfy the law of God. For the divine Law requires not only external deeds, but internal purity, fear, confidence, the supreme love of God, perfect obedience, and prohibits all vicious affections. But it is evident that in this corrupt nature men cannot render such perfect obedience." And in the following paragraph: "Without the Holy Spirit the human voluntas cannot work the spiritual deeds which God requires, the true fear of God, true confidence in the mercy of God. * * * Without the Holy Spirit it is

not possible to conceive the spiritual affections which God approves.

"They who are led by the Spirit of God are the sons of God. Also, if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his. These two passages are very clear, and they plainly testify that there is need of the Spirit in order that we may obey. But it is evident that by the words Holy Spirit, is meant not the human reason, but the Spirit of God working in our souls."

Not less clearly and emphatically is the same doctrine of the total spiritual inefficiency of the natural liberum arbitrium, and the absolute need of divine assistance, taught in the last edition of the *Loci*. The liberum arbitrium in homine facultatem esse applicandi se ad gratiam, is no exception, since it is introduced by the "Therefore some ancients thus have spoken," and by the three lines of the context, in the light of which, as Melanchthon begged, it should be interpreted, that is, as having reference to the regenerate.* And that the last vestige of doubt may be removed we now quote from his "definitions," delivered at Torgau and Wittenberg in 1552 and 1553: "The freedom of the human voluntas after the Fall, even in the unregenerate, is the faculty by which man can regulate his movements, that is, by his external members he can perform actions that are and that are not in harmony with the law of God, and various ones of both kinds. But he is not able *without the light of the Gospel and without the Holy Spirit* to remove doubts from the mind and vicious inclinations from the heart. But when he is drawn by the Holy Spirit he can follow and he can resist. Therefore the freedom becomes greater when the hearts renewed are governed by the Holy Spirit, as Paul says: They that are led by the Spirit are the sons of God. And then freedom is the faculty by which the regenerate man is able to obey the governing Holy Spirit, and not only to regulate the movements, but also to retain in the heart affections pleasing to God; and when the *word of God and the Holy Spirit precede*, he is

*See Dr. Runge's letter to Andreae in Frank's *Theologie der Concordien-formel*, I, pp. 198-9.

able also to resist vicious affections; and by his own will, without coercion, he is able to depart from the word of God and to will things contrary to the word of God; as Saul and David voluntarily, by their own will, and without coercion, went astray" (italics ours).

PROFESSOR PIEPER'S INTERPRETATION OF MELANCHTHON.

Not only has Professor Pieper excerpted Melanchthon, but he has interpreted him. The first excerpt he has interpreted as follows: "He (Melanchthon) meant to say: The grace of God is universal, it extends not only to a David, but also to a Saul. If now nevertheless David is saved, and Saul is rejected, this must have its reason in the fact that David, as compared with Saul, demeaned himself better towards the word of God and grace" (p. 7). On the next page he says: "Just so soon as he (Melanchthon) comes to the question: Why are not all men converted and saved, or, Why some before others—there the cause of conversion and of salvation lies in the *better conduct of the person*."

Now, this is by no means what Melanchthon says. He says not one word about *better conduct*. Better conduct implies merit, and this is utterly inconsistent with the emphasis that Melanchthon everywhere places on the *sola gratia*, and on the total inability of the natural man, of the man unenlightened by the divine word, unquickened by the Holy Ghost, to do a single thing that is spiritually acceptable to God, or that can in any sense be called evangelical righteousness. In proof of this, and in complete refutation of Professor Pieper's interpretation, we quote again a passage which stands in all the editions of the *Loci* of the third period: "Without the aid of the Holy Spirit the human will is not able to produce the spiritual affections which God requires." And in the edition of 1543: "The Gospel teaches that in nature there is a horrible corruption, which resists the law of God, that is, makes it impossible to present perfect obedience. And this corruption the human will is not able of itself to remove from nature; so also in regard

to death, which is the most proper fruit of that corruption, it cannot of itself remove it from nature. But in human nature the blindness is so great, that we are not able properly to understand that corruption. Hence we do not perceive how great is the weakness of the human powers. If we could rightly know this, then only could we understand that men are not able to satisfy the law of God."

These quotations absolutely exclude every phase and feature, every form and lineament, of the conception of *good conduct*, as a *causa meritoria* of salvation, or as being the cause why a person is saved. Between *aliqua actio dissimilis* and "better conduct," Professor Pieper's *besseres Verhalten*, there is no necessary connection, and *besseres Verhalten* is no proper translation of Melanchthon's *aliqua actio dissimilis*. It is the teaching of Melanchthon that men are saved by *grace alone*.* But men act differently toward the grace offered to all. Such is the plain teaching of the Scriptures, as it is also a fact of common observation. And this *aliqua actio dissimilis* is beautifully illustrated by Melanchthon in the German edition of the *Loci* of the third period: "Sometimes the choice proceeds from Free-will, and not from God, as when David resolved that he would take the wife of Urias and commanded that she should be brought to him. In Joseph when he would not consent to fornication, that power certainly comes from God, who rules and strengthens Joseph. Accordingly his will follows obediently, without coercion, and commands his eyes, mouth, hands and feet to avoid this fire. In such works the will is not a block or a stone; but God commands us to give earnest diligence in ruling all our members. Hence the declaration: *Praeeunte gratia, comitante voluntate*, that is, the divine grace

* As proof positive that Melanchthon affirms and reaffirms that "we are justified before God by faith alone," and that in conversion the action of the will is absolutely destitute of merit, we point with confidence to official documents written by him for and in connection with the Colloquy of Worms in 1557 and the Frankfort Recess in 1558. C. R. 9: 367-8; 403; 468, where he expressly rejects any such conception as that man has merit; and inferences to that effect from his premises he denounces as "malicious inferences," and as "cavils." See also pp. 495-6.

and assistance draw man to good works, yet in such a way that the Will follows and does not resist. For David fell of his own Free-will, and without coercion, and Joseph also could have fallen (also hette auch Joseph mügen fallen"). Here is *aliqua actio dissimilis*. The one man acted under the determination of his own *liberum arbitrium*. The other acted as directed and strengthened by God. According to the principle of *gratia universalis* the divine grace and help were common to both. In the one case the will followed. In the other case the will resisted. In both cases the will is neither a stock nor a stone, but a free self-determining personality which has not lost absolutely the image and likeness of God, and whose crowning glory is its essential freedom. In this free self-determining personality is a capability of religious and moral action. This capability is that of a living intelligent creature. This living intelligent creature receives impressions, and in so far it is *passive*; but it is of the very nature of this living intelligent creature *to respond* to impressions; that is, it perceives and knows, and puts forth intelligent choices, which are *acts*, exertions of power.

But it is the reiterated teaching of Melanchthon, as our quotations abundantly show, that no act of the unillumined, unassisted *liberum arbitrium* can satisfy the law of God, or can produce the spiritual affections that God approves. All its choices are averse from God, and from the spiritual import of the law. At this point Melanchthon stands in direct opposition to the Pelagians, whom he condemns times without number. But in affirming the essential freedom of the human will, its natural and inherent capability of responding to impressions, he opposes the Manichaeans, whom likewise he condemns times without number. In his view, when the voice of the gospel calls, and the Holy Spirit operates through the gospel, there is cause for *aliqua actio* in man. *Praecedente gratia, comitante voluntate, bona opera fieri.* Only under this condition can the will *obey* the voice of the gospel. But by its own natural power it can resist the voice of the gospel and can *reject* the promise of salvation. In the one case, as in the other,

there is *action*, a determination of the will. To deny this is to deny what every man experiences in his own consciousness, is to take away all feeling of responsibility, is to renounce the possibility of religion, is to reduce man to the condition of a stock or of a stone. Under the active agency of the divine word and the urgency of the Holy Spirit, the *liberum arbitrium*—mind and will conjoined—becomes a battle-ground on which man's *actio* becomes an *aliqua causa discriminis* why a Saul is rejected and a David is accepted, albeit without even the least intimation of merit, or of “better conduct” in the religious sense, just as there is no merit in the executive volition of the beggar who extends his hand to accept an alms. Hence Professor Pieper does Melanchthon's theology great injustice when he says: “According to the position of Melanchthon David says: ‘That I, David, am saved, while Saul is lost, I owe to my dissimilis *actio*, to by better conduct.’” Such is no more the theology of Melanchthon than it could have been the boast of David. It is the reiterated teaching of Melanchthon, as it would have been the grateful song of David in his own case, that man is saved by grace alone. The *praecunte gratia* is the cause of the *comitante voluntate*. But inasmuch as man is a rational being, possessing essential freedom of will, the *comitante voluntate* is a *sine qua non* of salvation, *aliqua causa discriminis* between David and Saul. “Where then is the glorying? It is excluded. By what manner of law? of works? Nay: but by a law of faith.” But what is the law of faith? It is that which Melanchthon had already taught in the *Apology*: “Faith is not only knowledge in the intellect, but also confidence in the will, that is, it is to will and to accept that which is offered in the promise”—where *velle* and *accipere* mean *action* in man, not mere passivity. So that as regards the essential thing in question, what Melanchthon teaches in the *Loci*, the Church teaches in the *Apology*. Man is not a block nor a stone. As over against the action of divine grace he holds himself in conversion as a free personality. When God draws by the application of means suited to the nature of a free per-

* Article III, Müller, section 183.

sonality, that free personality has power to follow, or, to resist, the drawing.

Very unfortunate also is Professor Pieper in other efforts to interpret Melanchthon. After quoting a number of passages of Scripture, such as Rom. 8:7; 1 Cor. 2:14; Eph. 2:15; Eph. 1:19, 20, he says: "Through all these passages Melanchthon draws a broad line. He says Yes, where the Scripture says No. The Scripture says of the unconverted man: *οὐ δυναται γνῶναι*. Melanchthon says: *δυναται γνῶναι*, liberum arbitrium est facultas applicandi se ad gratiam. The Scripture says of the will of the unconverted man: *ἐξ θρασεως*. Melanchthon says of the same will, that it is assentiens et non repugnans" (p. 18). The Scripture (1 Cor. 2:14) does indeed say that the natural man, *ψυχικος ἀνθρωπος*, cannot know the things of the Spirit. Now, will Professor Pieper, or will any man, tell us where Melanchthon ever said that the unconverted man *can know* the things of the Spirit? Instead of awaiting an answer to our question from any living mortal, we turn to Melanchthon himself. In the *Loci* of 1543 we read: "1 Cor. 2. The natural man perceiveth not the things which are of the Spirit of God. For the *ψυχικος* man means the man living the natural life, that is, by the natural sense and reason, without the Holy Spirit. For thus in this passage Paul distinguishes the natural man from the spiritual. For although the knowledge of God is naturally impressed upon man, yet this is so obscured that the mind cannot rightly assent to it, but doubts whether God cares for us, or punishes, or will pardon, or hear. This doubting brings it about that minds do not truly fear God etc."

Still more energetically does Melanchthon reply to our question in the German edition of *Loci* of the third period: "1 Cor. 2: The natural man comprehends not the Spirit of God; that is, all the natural powers in us, soul and heart, are without God; are full of doubt; in them is no true faith in God; they do not perceive the wrath of God; are stolid and hard; and thus they feel punished when they are not comforted through the Son of God by the gospel and the Holy Spirit; and when there is in them only the working of the

natural powers, there is vain doubt and eternal death, as in Saul, Ahithophel, Judas, and in many others."

And again: In the Reply to the Bavarian Articles, published only a few months before his death, and reaffirmed in his last Will and Testament, written the day before his death, as his "Confession against the Papists, the Anabaptists, Flacianists, and the like," Melanchthon says: "I expressly condemn the Pelagians, who imagine that there is no original sin, and so magnify the liberum arbitrium as to say that man by his natural powers, without the Holy Spirit, can satisfy the law of God by internal and external obedience. I turn with horror from these blasphemies, which bring reproach upon the Son of God and upon the Holy Spirit, and destroy the true doctrine of the law, of sin, of grace, and of the benefits of God, which are bestowed upon us through the Son our Lord Jesus Christ, and through the Holy Spirit. And I embrace the word of the Son of God: If the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed. And the words of Paul: They who are led by the Spirit, are the sons of God. Also: If any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of his, and I give thanks to God for these very great blessings, for the gift of the Son and for the Holy Spirit. Sin and death *cannot be removed by the liberum arbitrium* of men; nor is the human will able to *begin* internal obedience without the Son of God, without the gospel, without the Holy Spirit. Such liberty does *not* belong to the human will."* (Italics ours.)

We think the reader will regard Melanchthon's answer to our question as a complete refutation of Professor Pieper's allegation, that Melanchthon says of the unconverted man *δυναται* *γνῶναι*. And as for the liberum arbitrium est facultas, etc., by which Prof. Pieper attempts to support and to illustrate his allegation, we refer the reader to what we have already written about that excerpt, and to the context, and to Melanchthon's explanation, that it has reference to the regenerate, and to his statement of the reason why he introduced that passage: "Not on account of the Pelagians, and Papists, that he might

* Wittenberg edition of Works, I. 370-1.

confirm their impious opinions, but on account of our fanatics and Epicureans, or on account of anxious, struggling consciences, whom and which the devil entices and harasses with Manichaean and fanatical fancies"—all of which Professor Pieper has overlooked, or forgotten, or ignored; but which, taken together, puts an entirely different face on the subject, and shows that Professor Pieper has essentially misinterpreted Melanchthon, whom, not in the spirit of charity, but by the law of righteousness, we must allow to be the best interpreter of his own words.

The *Ἐχθρα αἰς θεόν* next claims our attention: "The Scripture says of the will of the unconverted man: *Ἐχθρα εἰς θεόν*. Melanchthon says of the same will that it is assentiens et non repugnans." In Romans 8:7 we are told that the carnal mind is enmity against God. In the last edition of Melanchthon's *Loci*, in the chapter entitled *De Peccato Originis*, we read: "Et. Rom. 8: [7]: The mind of the flesh is enmity against God. For it is not subject to the law of God, neither is it able to be. This is a sad and horrible description of human nature. For the words clearly show that it is spoken not only with reference to actual evil, but also with reference to the evil that inheres in nature itself, which it calls enmity against God. What worse could be said than that the nature of man is inimical to God; that is, that it constantly carries about with it darkness and doubts in regard to God, carelessness that neglects God, distrust that flees God, and manifold contumacy? These secret evils the careless and profane do not understand, but the Church in contrition does in some manner know them." In the preceding paragraph Melanchthon, after quoting Rom. 7:23, "I see a law in my members warring against the law of my mind," says: "For he calls the law of his members something in us warring (repugnans) against the law of God, namely, defects and depraved inclinations." Quoting in the following paragraph Eph. 2:3, "We are by nature the children of wrath, even as others," he says: "Children of wrath, a Hebrew phrase, that is, guilty and condemned. He therefore affirms that both the pos-

* Reported by Dr. Jacob Runge as told him by Melanchthon at Worms in 1557. Frank's *Theologie der Concordienformel*. I. pp. 135, 198.

terity of Abraham and other men are condemned, not only on account of actual sins, but also on account of the sin of nature which is propagated in us, and not acquired by example. And as to the characteristics of this sin of nature, these are shown in passages quoted from the seventh and eighth chapters" [of Romans].

These quotations show how far Professor Pieper is correct when he says: "Through all these passages Melanchthon draws a broad line," that is, blots them out. The facts are, that Melanchthon has quoted these passages, and has made such comment on them as ought to satisfy the most orthodox defender of the old Reformation doctrine of total depravity. We can excuse Professor Pieper's blunder only on the charitable supposition that his memory failed him at this point. But what shall we say about the *assentiens et nec repugnans*? This, at least, we shall say about it: Professor Pieper has torn these words utterly apart from their connection and has clothed them with a meaning entirely foreign to Melanchthon's conception. We quote the whole passage as Melanchthon wrote it: *Ac saepe dictum est, cogitantes de Deo oportere ordiri a verbo Dei, non quaerere Deum sine suo verbo. Cumque ordimur a verbo, hic concurrunt tres causae bonae actionis, verbum Dei, Spiritus Sanctus, et humana voluntas assentiens, nec repugnans verbo Dei. Posset enim excutere, ut excutit Saul sua sponte; sed cum mens audiens ac se sustentans non repugnat, non indulget diffidentiae, sed adjuvante etiam Spiritu Sancto conatur assertiri, in hoc certamine voluntas non est otiosa.** (Italics ours.)

We thus see the connection in which Melanchthon uses the *assentiens nec repugnans*. Neither in the paragraph of which these words form a part, nor in the preceding one, has he been speaking of unconverted persons, but of the Church, of the living members of the Church, and of the operation of the Holy Spirit through the gospel. Moreover, conversion is not here the subject of discussion, but "a good action," which can be done only when a person comforts himself by the word of God, and is assisted by the Holy Spirit. Melanchthon's conception

* Translated above.

is that when a person meditates on the word of God and comforts and sustains himself by that word, that is, holds on to the divine word, because quickened and sustained by the energy inherent in that word, and because assisted by the Holy Spirit operating through the gospel—that such a person is no longer the *ψυχικός ἀνθρώπος* that he once was. He is no longer in the darkened state of nature. He may be able only to see men as trees walking, but that is to be not absolutely blind. A change has come over him. He thinks as he never thought before. He feels as he never felt before. A new thought has entered into his mind. A new impulse has entered into his heart. This new thought, this new impulse, from above; this new life, indeed, for all thought is life, and all feeling is life—call it *illumination*, or call it with our old theologians *conversio prima*, or *regeneratio in actu primo spectata*—this, call it what you please, the human will has power to extinguish, as Saul extinguished it; but it can also entertain it, and *adjuvante etiam Spiritu Sancto* it can strive to assent to the word of God, and can resist the approaches of unbelief. Further than this Melanchthon does not go in his use of the *assentens nec repugnans*. He recognizes man as a being endowed with mind and will, both of which are essentially *active*, and which never fail to *act*, when a cause or a stimulus for action is given. It is the function of the mind to perceive, to know, to compare, to judge. It is the function of the will to choose and to execute. When the word of God, which is essentially energising, and the Holy Spirit, who is life-giving, as causes—for such Melanchthon holds them to be—operate upon the mind of man, his will is bound to *act*. *Ex necessitate rei* it must *assent*, or *resist*. It cannot remain absolutely *inert*. Joining its action with the other two by assenting, it becomes the third factor of "a good action." He who does not recognize these fundamental facts in considering the causes of "a good action" may well declaim, as Professor Pieper does (p. 18), against the folly of trying to explain by the *principles of reason* why it is that some men are converted and saved rather than others—a thing which Melanchthon does not undertake to do. When in this *Locus De Humanis Viribus* he speaks of those

matters commonly comprehended by us under the words *Regeneration* and *Conversion* he does so simply by quoting John 3:15; 5:44; 13:5, without note or comment. He then passes immediately on to treat of the Church, of the true members of the Church, who have the Holy Spirit, and of pardon and of eternal life. Then in the next paragraph comes the *assentiens, nec repugnans* in the relation given in the Latin quotation.

And should it even be conceded that in this passage Melanchthon is treating of conversion, still he does not go one step further in the use of the words in question than does Chemnitz, who has never been accused of any departure from the Lutheran faith. Hear what this champion of Lutheranism says: "Conversion, or renewal, is not a change that is finished and perfected in all its parts in a single moment. But it has its beginnings, its progressive movements, by which in great weakness it is accomplished. Therefore, it is not to be supposed that I am to wait with a *careless* and *inert* will until renewal or conversion, according to its recognized gradations, shall have been perfected by the operation of the Holy Spirit without any *action on my part*. Neither can it be shown with mathematical accuracy when the will liberated begins to act. But when preventer grace, that is, the first beginnings of faith and conversion are given in a person, at once begins a struggle between the flesh and the Spirit, and it is evident that that struggle does not take place without an *action of our will*. For the Holy Spirit strove against the flesh of the living Moses otherwise than Michael strove with the devil about the dead body of Moses, Jud. v. 9. Also, in the beginning desire is very indistinct, *assent* is very languid, obedience is very slight. These gifts ought to increase. But they increase not as a block is carried forward by a violent push, or as the lilies grow without toil and without care, *sed conando, luctando, quaerendo, petendo, pulsando*. Such a gift is not of ourselves, it is of God. Luk. 19:13. The man who gave talents to his servants says: *Trade till I come*, Matt. 25:26. He does not say: *Hide them in the earth*. And Paul employs a very clear word, 2 Tim. 1:26: *I exhort thee to stir up* the gift of God that is in thee.

"Therefore, what has been said about preventer, preparing,

operating grace, has this meaning, viz: that *our* part in conversion does not precede; but that God, by the word and the divine energy, anticipates us, moving and impelling the will. After this movement of the will has been divinely produced, the human will does *not hold itself in a purely passive way*, but, moved and assisted by the Holy Spirit, it does not *resist (non repugnat)*, but *assents (assentitur)*—the very words used by Melanchthon, and used by Chemnitz in the same relation to the word of God and to the operation of the Holy Spirit—"and becomes a *co-worker with God*."* (Italics ours). To which we are bound to say: If a *co-worker* in conversion, then a *co-agent of conversion*. But as with Melanchthon, *third* in the order of action.

That Chemnitz may make his meaning plainer he refers to Augustine's conversion as furnishing "a living illustration of this subject as to the manner in which amid the obscure sparks and feeble beginnings of preventer grace, the will is not *inert*, but a *struggle* begins between the flesh and the Spirit." (Italics ours). Then in the same chapter, after quoting Rom. 10:17: "Faith comes by hearing," he says, in the very words of Melanchthon: "The Spirit operates through the voice of the gospel, heard and meditated upon, and preventer grace begins with the word. And rightly is it said: There are three causes of a good action. 1. The word of God. 2. The Holy Spirit. 3. The human will, provided it be rightly and properly understood"—which last observation imposes a heavy moral obligation on the critics of Melanchthon.

In the *Loci* of 1543 Melanchthon wrote: "The Holy Spirit operates through the word. Thus as Paul says: The Spirit assists our infirmity. In this struggle the mind must be exhorted to make every effort to retain the word. It must not be dehorting from trying, but must be taught that the promise is universal, and that it ought to believe. In this case we see that three causes are conjoined, the word, the Holy Spirit and the will not absolutely *inert*, but *resisting its own infirmity*." (Italics ours). But nowhere does Melanch-

* *Loci, De Libero Arbitrio. Cap. VII.*

thon teach that in conversion the three causes are *coordinate*, or make *equivalent* contributions to the result. His language forbids any such conception.* With him the word of God is the instrumental cause, the Holy Spirit is the efficient cause, the will is the assenting cause.† When the word impinges upon the will, and the Holy Spirit shows the things of Christ, the will *does* something. It either makes resistance to the message of salvation, or it gives assent to it, that is, goes out in friendly thought to it. He means that the will is in some way *active*.

Such is Melanchthon's doctrine of the three causes, and such doctrine appeared in every edition of the *Loci* from 1543 on, and, as we have seen, was repeated and endorsed by the ablest

* C. R. 13 : 427.

† Such a distinction of causes is nominal, relative, conventional, rather than real. In the realm of mind at least, everything is cause, which, in any way, shape or form contributes to the production of psychical effect. And in such realm every cause *in actu*, is simultaneously interlaced with the effect, and is jointly concerfied in it, and is at once cause and effect, acting and acted upon. The relation of the two is reciprocal. With this agrees essentially Melanchthon's definition of cause: *Causa per se est proprie causa. Est autem causa, qua posita in actu, necesse est sequi effectum, conjunctis omnibus per se causis, et qua non posita, non sequitur effectus.* C. R. 13, p. 307. Hence, since the human soul is a self-active entity, it must follow that conversion, which is an effect wrought in the soul, is connected with the activity of mind acted upon and acting. Hence, also, the theory of pure passivity is philosophically, psychologically and theologically untenable. From the very nature of the human mind as potentiality for cause, and as a self-active entity, the will cannot be absolutely *inert* in conversion; for though perception, feeling and willing are not identical, yet they are inseparable. Where and when the one is, there and then the others are. The two last could not exist without the first, and the first would be self-consumed without the renewal and stimulus of the other two. They are all activities of the one identical indivisible conscious *ego*. Hence, when the *ego* perceives the truth, the *ego* feels the truth, the *ego* acts with reference to the truth. A defective philosophy, which does not rightly interpret the relation of cause and effect, and a defective psychology, which does not rightly interpret the activities of the soul, have betrayed Missouri into a defective theology. Of course, however, in matters of theology Missouri repudiates philosophy and psychology as the devil's will-o'-the-wisp, but all the worse for Missouri.

of the authors of the Form of Concord, by the man who stands at the head of the list of Lutheran dogmaticians.

And that the reader may understand more fully how Melanchthon used the *assentiens, nec repugnans*, and may perceive how utterly unjust is Professor Pieper's imputation of folly, and his hint at rationalism, we quote a passage in which Melanchthon expressly treats of conversion: "Let us begin with the voice of the gospel, and let us tremble at the knowledge of the wrath of God against sin, and let us flee to the Son, and let us pray as the Prophet says: Convert me and I shall be converted. When this is done these causes concur, the voice of the gospel and the Son of God inwardly teaching us, and at the same time pouring out the Holy Spirit, who strengthens the heart, so that *assent* and *obedience* may be conjained. And our will concurs by striving to *assent* to, and not to *resist*, the word of God. For it is able to shake it off, as Saul shook it off of his own accord. In this conflict the Mind and Will are *assisted* by the Son of God *teaching within*, and by the Holy Spirit *strengthening* the heart, and yet Mind and Will are not in the condition of a statue. Hence the ancients have said: *Praecedente gratia, comitante voluntate, bona opera fieri*"* (italics ours).

According to Melanchthon the will *assents to* and *does not resist* the word of God only *after* Christ has inwardly taught us, and has given us the Holy Spirit to strengthen our hearts. He nowhere says of the will of the unconverted man, of the man destitute of prevenient grace and of the presence and energy of the Holy Spirit, that it is *assentiens et nec repugnans*. Such a thought is contradicted by the whole tone and tenor of his teaching on sin and grace. His position is that while the gospel and the Holy Spirit are operating on the heart, the will is so strengthened that it can assent to the divine operation, and by so doing it becomes concurring cause of a good action, inasmuch as it is not a statue, but a living activity; in which teaching it is evident that Melanchthon uses the word "causes" as the sum total of the activities that contribute

* *Enarratio Symboli Niceni Postrema, 1557. De Libero Arbitrio.*

to the production of the result, but without specifying the amount contributed by any particular activity.

But this teaching offends Professor Pieper, because it does not represent man, as does the Form of Concord, as a stone, a block, a wild beast. And yet it is gratifying to know that the author of the Augsburg Confession and its Apology in his doctrine of the will and of conversion, was followed almost literally by the chief author of the Form of Concord. That this may now be fully demonstrated, we place a few characteristic passages from each in juxtaposition. Melanchthon: "The human will is not able without the Holy Spirit to produce the affections which God requires." Chemnitz: "The human will by its own powers, without the Holy Spirit, is not able to begin inner and spiritual affections, or to offer and produce the inner obedience of the heart." Melanchthon: "It is necessary for us to know that we men by the powers of Free-will, without the Holy Spirit, are not able to make for ourselves a heart in which can be found true confidence, true fear of God, true hearty love and gratitude, patience and obedience toward God, and like fruits of the Spirit." Chemnitz: "If it be inquired, What can Free-will of itself, of its own nature, of its own powers, without the grace of renovation, do in spiritual actions, it is rightly answered, Nothing." Melanchthon: "The will is not a block or a stone." Chemnitz: "Not as a block is carried forward by a violent push." Melanchthon: "The Holy Spirit operates through the voice of the gospel heard or meditated upon." Chemnitz: "The Spirit operates through the voice of the gospel heard or meditated upon, and prevenient grace begins with the word." Melanchthon: "Saul flees God, does not call upon him, does not determine to be assisted by him. * * * There is some cause of the difference, why Saul is rejected." Chemnitz: "Saul had the word of God, and the good Spirit operated upon him, that is, the *two causes* were present, but because he presented the opposition of his will, the Holy Spirit departed from him" (italics ours). Melanchthon: "When grace precedes and the will follows, good works are done." Chemnitz: "For a good action the human will concurs, but not as a captive and dead, such as

it is per se and by nature, as described in Eph. 2:1, but liberated and quickened by the Holy Spirit." Melanchthon: "When the mind hears and comforts itself, and does not resist, and does not indulge in distrust, but by the aid of the Holy Spirit tries to assent, in such a conflict the will is not inert." Chemnitz: "When the mind hears and meditates on the word, and comforts itself, and does not resist; yea, when it earnestly struggles, as we see in the case of Augustine, it is certain that the Holy Spirit is active in moving, impelling, and assisting the will."

Finally, as regards the three concurring causes of a good action, they employ the very same identical words, and both employ them with the caution that the matter be rightly understood. These comparisons might be greatly extended; but what gives them their peculiar value is the fact that the Melanchthon quotations are all taken from the *Locus de Libero Arbitrio* of the *Loci* of the third period, and the Chemnitz quotations, with a single exception, are taken from the seventh chapter of his *Locus de Libero Arbitrio*. The doctrine that they teach is so absolutely identical that if Melanchthon be synergistic,* equally so is Chemnitz. If Melanchthon says *δυναται γνωριμα*, so does Chemnitz. If Melanchthon says of the unconverted will, *assentiens, nec repugnans*, so does Chemnitz: If Melanchthon tries to answer the question, *Cur alii praelati vernunftgemäss*, so does Chemnitz. If Melanchthon denies that the human will is a block, so does Chemnitz. If Melanchthon maintains that three causes concur in a good action, so does Chemnitz. Hence if Melanchthon be against Professor Pieper's interpretation of the Form of Concord, equally so is Chemnitz, for in the essential points they teach alike, namely, that in conversion the will, aroused by the word of God and sustained by the Holy Spirit, becomes in some sense *active*. Under the given conditions the will does something. In the

* We are not aware that Melanchthon ever employed the words, *synergia* or *synergismus*, in connection with his doctrine of the will. But they were employed by some of his disciples, some of whom carried the doctrine of Free-will in the direction of Semi-Pelagianism; as on the contrary, Amsdorf, Flacius and others carried Luther's doctrine of the Will to the very confines of Manichaeism.

language of both Melanchthon and Chemnitz it *assents*, it does not *resist*, it is not *inert*. They both teach that conversion is a work of God and also an action of man—an action which has absolutely no justifying merit, and which, but for the excitation from above, could not and would not exist. Hence salvation has its root and ground principle in *sola gratia*. Man can do nothing to merit salvation.* He can do nothing to make it congruous that God should confer beginning grace, nor can he do anything to make it condign that God should confer supplementary grace. But he can hear and can meditate on the divine word; he can permit the Holy Spirit to show him the things of Christ; he can hold on to the promise of pardon; he can repent of his sins; he can *assent* to the word of God. To deny that he can do these things when the word of God and the Holy Spirit are acting in him, is to affirm that he is a stone, a wild beast, and not a rational being. This is exactly the position of Professor Pieper, who, while correctly enough claiming that salvation is alone of grace, absolutely excludes all thought of *assentiens nec repugnans* on the part of man; in his own almost untranslatable German: "Besseres Verhalten, Unterlassung des muthwilligen Widerstrebens, Selbstentscheidung, Hingebung an die nicht unwiderstehlich wirkende Gnade oder sonstwie nennen,"—all these actions and everything else that can be named, are excluded by Professor Pieper from the side of man as a ground of explanation why some men are converted and saved. He insists that "human decision," "human conduct," "the cessation of malicious resistance," have absolutely nothing to do with a man's salvation. The cause of the difference between being saved and being lost lies solely and alone in the grace of God. p. 46.

"But the cause," says Professor Pieper, "of the non-conversion and the being lost in the case of those who actually remain unbelieving and are rejected, is their own fault, namely

* As conclusive proof of this in the teaching of Melanchthon we quote as follows: *Continget igitur promissa reconciliatio, non propter aliquod nostrum opus, aut nostram dignitatem, aut nostras virtutes illas, sed propter Christum, et tamen aliquid esse oportet, quo id beneficium accipiamus. Fide igitur accipimus.* C. R. 13:427.

their resistance, or their ill-conduct, which they set over against the converting activity of the Holy Spirit in the word. A want of grace on the part of God is not to be assigned as the reason for, or as the explanation of, the guilt or evil conduct of men, as though God did not sincerely will to convert and save all men." He then proceeds immediately to say: "Whatever goes out beyond these points the Scripture assigns to the hidden ways and judgments of God, which we cannot and should not inquire into" (p. 25).

This is what Professor Pieper and his fellow-Missourians regard as "the correct position" (p. 24). But he has not answered the query, "Cur alii prae aliis?" He has simply turned that query over to "the hidden ways and judgments of God," which is only another way of turning it over to "the hidden God," with whom, as Luther said, we have nothing to do; or it is a turning of it over to the Calvinistic secret election of God. And this is the point at which the teaching at St. Louis in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and the teaching at Geneva in the sixteenth century first meet and begin to join hands, notwithstanding the many disclaimers that have come from St. Louis, and the many protestations on the part of the Missourians that theirs is the genuine old Lutheran teaching.

And in addition to what Professor Pieper says in the pamphlet before us, we may refer to a series of articles in Vols. 5 and 6 of the *Monatshefte*, from the pen of Pastor Hügli, who professes to state the position of Missouri. He calls the Calvinistic doctrine of Predestination "ungodly," and claims to hold the old Lutheran doctrine. But he not only declares that in conversion man is purely *passive*; he declares also: "That a person to whom the word of God is presented does not maliciously resist, but accepts the Word of God and believes, has its fundamental reason (Grund) not in the person, but solely and alone in God and in his grace;" and: "When God by his grace turns himself to a person, the resistance vanishes just as the snow melts before the ray of the warming sun of Spring;" and: "It originates primarily from the eternal ordination of God, who shall be saved." There can be no doubt that this

last proposition involves the doctrine of eternal predestination, since it makes the ordination of God the *prius* in the argument, which expressly excludes "human decision," and "foreseen conduct." The other two propositions ignore the ethical character of conversion, and contain in embryo all that is involved in the *gratia irresistibilis*. And these three propositions are supported by a fourth: "God also takes away from the elect often the most malicious resistance"—which, as used by Pastor Hügli, involves the whole doctrine of the absolute predestination, since those from whom God removes "the most malicious resistance" have been already *elected*, which implies that those from whom he does not remove such resistance, and indeed all resistance, have not been elected. That is, it implies discrimination on the part of God. And that we are justified in drawing this conclusion, is evident from what the Missouri Synod itself has said: "It originates primarily from the eternal ordination (Versehung) of God, who is to believe, and who is not to believe; because if it comes from Versehung who is to believe, it certainly comes also from the same source, who is not to believe."*

Now, if there be any difference between the Missouri doctrine of election and the Calvinistic at this point, it is only, or

*Quoted in *Monatshefte* 5, p. 78, by Professor G. Fritschel, who earnestly contests Pastor Hügli's propositions, and finds in them the *gratia irresistibilis*, the absolute predestination, the Augustinian doctrine of predestination, and declares that the reason why some men are converted and saved, and others are not, does not have its ground in the "secret will of God," but "in the will of man." "It has its ground in the free self-determination of man, though this is first rendered possible only through grace" (p. 80), which in essence is exactly the teaching of Melanchthon; though Melanchthon used the terminology of his age, and was at a disadvantage from the fact that the Lutheran theology had not yet made a proper distinction between regeneration and conversion. In the former, man is passive. In the latter, he is active in response to God's activity in him as an intelligent, susceptible, volitive being, who, influenced and led by grace, is actively capable of receiving and accepting grace for grace. Melanchthon may not have always expressed himself in the most correct way, but he was not mistaken in the matter itself. If man were a block or a stone, there would be in him no point of contact for divine grace.

at least chiefly, this: With Missouri, election, salvation, flows from the discriminating, differentiating, *grace* of God; while with the Calvinists, election, salvation, flows from the discriminating, differentiating, *will* of God. The effect is the same. Salvation is in reality possible only for a part of mankind, that is, for the elect, who can neither finally resist grace nor lose grace.

And as further evidence of the essential identity of the teaching of the former and of the present generation of Missouri theologians, with that of Calvin, in the main point, viz., in the divine discrimination in the application of grace, we quote what Professor Pieper is reported to have said at the Watertown Free Conference, and to have repeated substantially at the Milwaukee Conference only a few months later: * "The Scripture tells us that it is the will of God to save all men (Die Schrift sagt uns, Gott wolle alle Menchen selig machen), then again: It is the will of God to save some men, then also: It is the will of God to damn some men." That is, God's real will of salvation does not exist in the *promissio universalis*, in the *gratia universalis*, of "the proclaimed God;" in other words, the promise is not, as Luther declared, *in omnes, super omnes*; nor does it embrace *omnes universaliter* as Melanchthon declared it does. The will to save all men is limited and determined by the will to save some men, and to damn others. And what is this in effect but Calvinism pure and simple? God's real will is to save some men, and to damn others. The premises admit of no other conclusion. Indeed, there is no need of deduction, or of inference. The second and third affirmations are explicit and unqualified: "Gott wolle einige Menchen selig machen,—dann auch: Gott wolle einige Menchen verdammen."

* By Pastor Geo. J. Fritschel in the October (1903) No. of *Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, p. 233. Also essentially the same, as the position of Missouri, by Dr. J. L. Neve, in *The Lutheran Observer*, Oct. 23rd, 1903, and in *The Lutheran Standard*, Sept. 19th, 1903, by Dr. F. W. Stellhorn. As these writers are all Germans, and are gentlemen of strictest integrity and of ample intelligence, there can be no reasonable question as to the essential correctness of the representations. See also *Theol. Zeitblaetter*, Sept., 1903. Article by Dr. Stellhorn.

As a matter of fact there is no real, sincere *promissio universalis*. It is not the will of God from eternity to save all men who believe in Jesus Christ—that is to say, to save all men *propter Christum* who believe in Jesus Christ, which is the genuine old Lutheran doctrine as touching “the proclaimed God” and the will of God as set forth in the Scriptures. Even in the *De Servo Arbitrio* Luther says: “If God does not will death, it must be imputed to our will, that we perish. Rightly I say, if you speak of the proclaimed God, for he wills that all men be saved, inasmuch as by the word of salvation he comes to all, and it is the fault of the *voluntas*, which does not admit him. How often would I have gathered thy children, but ye would not” (p. 222-3). And after quoting Colossians 2 : 3 : “Therefore the Incarnate God says here: *Volui et tu noluisti*. The Incarnate God, I say, was sent into the world that he might will, might speak, might do, might suffer, might offer for all men all things that are necessary unto salvation” (p. 227-8). But according to Professor Pieper the reason why belongs absolutely to the *voluntas Dei*, rather to the *voluntas benefacit*, to “the hidden ways and judgments of God.” The logic is inevitable. If the cause or reason why some men are saved rather than others be *wholly* with God—who wills to save some men and wills also to damn some men—if there be no *actio dissimilis* in man; if there be no *aliqua causa discriminis* in the will of man; if the *tota causa* be in God; then God acts in one way toward some men, and toward others, equally unworthy, in another way. To some he gives sufficient grace to believe and be saved. From others he withholds effectual grace, or fails to impart sufficient grace to save them. In a word, it is his will to save some. It is his will to damn others. The universal will of salvation is limited by the two subsequent wills of God, one of which has some men as its special object, and the other has as its special object other some men. What is this in effect but the *praedestinatio gemina*? Names are nothing. Causes and effects are everything. “If we speak of different wills in God, the reason for this is the limitation of our understanding, which can know but one thing at a time,” says Professor Pieper. Passing by the questionable psychology in this

explanation, we say: Be it so, that there is only one will in God. But this does not help the matter in question. In the case of some men that will is a will of salvation. In the case of some men that will is a will of damnation. What then becomes of the *gratia universalis*? It is excluded. God does not offer his grace equally, that is *savingly*, to all who hear the gospel. And what becomes of the *promissio universalis*? It likewise is excluded. God's promise does not embrace *omnes universaliter*. In reality there is no *promissio universalis* in the sense of the old Lutheran theology. There is the secret election of grace. There is selection, which implies rejection. There is discrimination. "It is the will of God to save some men, then also: It is the will of God to damn some men." We say unqualifiedly that this is not the old Lutheran theology, when we have reference to "the proclaimed God," to the "revealed will of God, upon which we must look when we would know the will of God." "Though God knows all things, and though all works and thoughts in all creatures take place according to the decree of his will, yet it is his earnest will, purpose, intention and command, resolved on from eternity, to save all men, and make them partakers of everlasting joy, as is distinctly set forth in Eze. 18:23, where it is said: *God wills not the death of a sinner, but that he should turn and live.* He wills to save sinners, living and moving everywhere under the wide heavens. * * * From the rising to the setting of the sun, from midday to midnight, he extends his grace, and overshadows all who turn and truly repent and desire to be made partakers of his mercy: *For he is rich unto all who call upon him*, Rom. 10:13. But to this corresponds a right, true faith, which expels fear and doubt as to what is our righteousness."* Contrasting this, now, with Professor Pieper's second and third propositions, and with his appeal to "the secret ways and judgments of God," we hazard nothing in saying that his "correct

*Luther's *Briefe*, III, 355. We are ready to concede that the Missouri doctrine is based largely on Luther's doctrine of "the Hidden God," as set forth in the *De Servo Arbitrio*; but it has lately been shown in the QUARTERLY, that neither Luther nor the Lutheran Church built on "the Hidden God," but on "the Proclaimed God," by the *a posteriori* method.

position" is not that of the genuine old Lutheran teaching. He may have eyes sharp enough to see a fundamental difference between his doctrine of conversion and predestination, and that once taught at Geneva, but a very large number of theologians, both Lutherans and Calvinists, have seen the Missouri doctrine essentially as we have seen it, and have described it essentially as we have described it. So long as he limits his first proposition by his second and third, and treats man as a block or as a stone, and excludes all activity of the human will in conversion, he is not teaching

THE OLD LUTHERAN DOCTRINE.

1. In the Augsburg Confession of 1530-1 it is simply said in Article XVIII that "without the grace, assistance and operation of the Holy Spirit, man is unable to become pleasing to God, or to fear God in heart, or to believe on him or to cast out of his heart innate evil," etc.—which clearly implies that by the assistance of the Holy Spirit, man *can* do those things. It is neither said nor implied that in the work of conversion man is wholly passive, and that his will is absolutely inert. Moreover, we must read this article in the light of Melanchthon's well-known doctrine of the will as expressed in his *Commentary on Colossians* in 1527, to which Luther made no objection.

2. In the *Confessio Variata* of 1540, prepared by official authorization, revised and approved by Luther, and employed officially in several diets as the genuine Lutheran Confession, it is said: "Spiritual righteousness is wrought in us when we are *helped* by the Holy Spirit. Moreover, we receive the Holy Spirit when we *assent* unto the word of God, so that through faith we are comforted in terrors of conscience" (italics ours). For twenty years the *Variata*, and consequently its doctrine of the will, was endorsed by the entire Lutheran Church. There is not in existence a solitary authentic word of opposition to it so long as its author lived.

3. What Melanchthon taught on the Will in the *Loci* of 1535 and of 1543, need not be reproduced here. But the signifi-

cance of his teaching in these and in subsequent years is shown and illustrated by a letter written by Melanchthon in 1549, in which he tells us that he "submitted all his writings to the judgment of our Church and to Luther himself, and that on many subjects he distinctly inquired of Luther for his opinion."* Hence Melanchthon's teaching was not alone his, but also that of the Lutheran Church, and of Luther himself, who, it is well-known, endorsed Melanchthon's *Loci* in 1545 in words which are now immortal, but which are never quoted by men who take the attitude toward Melanchthon that is taken by Professor Pieper. From 1537 on for more than ten years no voice was raised against Melanchthon's doctrine of the will except that of one Cordatus, who was soon silenced. After 1548 the Flacianists, who were essentially Manichaeans, found fault with the *Liberum Arbitrium in homine esse facultatem* etc., which they perverted, just as the Form of Concord has perverted it, interpreting it as meaning something absolutely foreign to Melanchthon's reiterated declarations.

4. In 1551 Melanchthon wrote in the *Confessio Saxonica* : "The will, when the Holy Spirit has been accepted, is not now *inert*" (italics ours). The plain meaning of this passage is that the will *accepts* the promises of the Gospel, which acceptance is an act, though not an act wrought by man's natural powers, but through the Son of God; nevertheless an *act* of the human will. Surely Professor Pieper will not find his conception of the old Lutheran doctrine of conversion and of predestination in the *Confessio Saxonica*, which was subscribed by the theologians of Wittenberg, Leipzig, Brandenburg, Ansbach-Baireuth, Mansfeld, Stolberg, Königstein, Greifswald, Pomerania, Wuertemberg and Strassburg.

5. In the *Examen Ordinandorum*, which had a very wide endorsement and use in the examination of thousands of candidates for the ministry, it is said: "In conversion three causes concur, the word of God, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father and the Son send to illumine our hearts, and our will assenting to, and not resisting, the word of God."†

* Wittenberg Ed. II, p. 153.

† C. R. 23 : 15.

The documents from which we have quoted—not even wholly excepting the *Loci*, since they were unqualifiedly endorsed by Luther and were most widely read and studied—present the official teaching of the old Lutheran Church, either of the Church as a whole, or in very large parts of it, down until after the death of Melanchthon; and the Augsburg Confession presents that teaching to the entire Lutheran Church, for Melanchthon to the latest day of his life declared his adherence to that Confession, and consequently saw no difference between its teaching on the will and that contained in the *Loci* and in the other documents named above, that proceeded from his hand.

We turn from official teaching to that of standard theologians.

1. John Brentz might fittingly be called the oracle of the Wuertemberg Lutheran Church. He wrote the *Confessio Wirtembergica* and its Apology. In the Apology, pp. 283-4, we find *inter alia* the following: "But some one says: If after the Fall no power is left in Free-will, except to sin, and if Free-will of itself is only the slave, captive, servant of Satan, what, I pray, is the difference between a man and a stone or a block? Or as a block of wood on being made into a statue does nothing, but only suffers, is Free-will likewise merely *passive*, so to speak, in acquiring salvation? *By no means*. Free-will does not indeed of itself have anything by which it can prepare itself for salvation, or by which it can merit salvation, but it has that by which it *accepts* the favor of God. * * * That God hated Esau and loved Jacob does not arise from the preparation of Jacob, much less from his merit, but alone from the gracious election of God. And yet Jacob was not related to election as a *block* or a *stone*. For a block was not created by God so as to have a *capacity* for the divine election, nor is there in a block an *arbitrium*, which by the *ordinary divine dispensation* is able to be converted to *accept* the gifts of the Holy Spirit. Jacob and Esau are men created in the image and likeness of God, and have *capacity* for the gifts of the Holy Spirit and of eternal salvation. In each one is an *arbitrium* [mind and heart], which, though it

has become the servant of Satan, nevertheless *retained an aptitude by which it is able* to be turned through the Holy Spirit to the liberty of righteousness. This aptitude of the *arbitrium* makes the difference between Jacob and a block; it does not make the difference between Jacob and Esau." (Italics ours).

The points to be noted in this exposition are: Man is not a block or a stone; he is not even *like* a block or a stone; he has *arbitrium*, which a block does not have; he has *aptitude of arbitrium* which a block cannot be said to have; he has *capacity* for the gifts of the Holy Spirit; he is *able* TO ACCEPT the favor of God; he is not *merely passive* in acquiring salvation, and if not merely passive, then in some sense active, or in the language of Melanchthon: "Free-will does something" (agit aliquid liberum arbitrium).

This, now, is the old Lutheran doctrine of conversion, as understood and taught by one of the greatest theologians of the first generation of Lutheran Reformers. But it will not suit Professor Pieper, for the reason that it is decidedly in opposition to the teaching of the Form of Concord, which, in his judgment, is the *Lapis Lydius* for testing all doctrines of all times.

2. Nicholas Selneccer, one of the authors of the Form of Concord, was certainly a representative of the old Lutheran doctrine. He says that God does not convert a person as "a stone, or a block, or an ox, or an ass, but as a man endowed with reason, and created in the image of God." Again: "We know that man must be distinguished from a stone, from a block, and from irrational animals, which were not created in the image of God, and for which Christ did not die, and which cannot understand the word of God when they hear it." He then quotes Brentz, as we have quoted him above, and finally St. Bernard, who says: "Take away Free-will, and there will be nothing to be saved. Take away grace, and there will be nothing by which to be saved."*

3. We have already quoted from Chemnitz's *Loci*. We now turn to his *Examen Concilii Tridentini*, one of the most highly

* *Institutio Christianae Religionis.*

prized of the old Lutheran theological classics, published in the year 1565. He describes conversion as follows: "After the gift and operation of the Holy Spirit there are present and follow new operations in the mind, in the will and in the heart. This healing and renovation is not a change of such a nature that it is finished and perfected in a single moment. But it has its beginnings and certain progressive movements, by which in great weakness it *grows, increases and is conserved*; but not as the lilies of the field grow, which toil not, nor take any care; but by *exercising repentance, faith and obedience, quaerendo, petitendo, pulsando, conando, luctando, etc.* the beginnings of the spiritual gifts are retained, grow and are increased, as in Luke 19 the master in bestowing the talents commands that they be not buried in the earth, but: *Trade till I come.* And to the same intent Paul employs a most beautiful word, *ἀναπεπλεύτην*, Stir up the gift that is in thee (2 Tim. 1). And because we must begin with the word and from the word must determine in regard to the will of God, and the action of the Holy Spirit, there is no doubt that when the word is read, heard and meditated on, man *conceives* the purpose, the desire, the effort, of application, when he *struggles* with security, unbelief and hardness, etc. These are the true affections of the Holy Spirit. * * * This also is certain, that conversion and renovation *do not take place* without some *operation and action of the mind, of the will and of the heart.*"* (Italics ours). Again, in the following chapter: "When the Holy Spirit through the word *begins* to heal nature by kindling some spark of spiritual efficiency and power, although renewal is not at once perfect and complete, but only in great weakness begun, then neither mind nor heart is *inert*; but they have some new *operations*, which they ought to *exercise—meditando, orando, conando, luctando, etc.*" (Italics ours). And on the next following page, after declaring that "we must necessarily *consent* to the grace of God, that our good is not *ex necessitate*, but *voluntary*;" that "to will is the property of the voluntas;" that "grace does not operate in the will of man as stones are rolled and as inanimate things are moved;" he declares: "The Scripture distinctly affirms that in spiritual

* De Libero Arbitrio, p. 128, Preuss edition.

things the renewed perceive, know, believe, assent, desire, or strive, struggle, etc., which beyond controversy are actions of mind and will. But the mind and the will cannot of their own strength *begin* or perform such actions. Hence for this reason grace illuminates the mind, turns and changes the will by furnishing new efficiency and new powers, so that from being ignorant men they become intelligent, from being unwilling they become willing; and thus in conversion the mind and the will—that which by their own strength they previously were not able to do—now, after the gift and by the operation of the Spirit of renewal, *begin to have spiritual emotions and actions, intelligendo, cogitando, judicando, desiderando, conando, luctando, volendo, faciendo, etc.*" (Italics ours).

Thus by the use of the most emphatic words, by iteration and by reiteration, Chemnitz declares for the *activity* of the mind and of the will in conversion. The mind and the will by means of their natural powers can neither begin nor perform spiritual actions; but when the Holy Spirit through the word works on the intellectual and conative faculties of man, their natural inertness is removed, and they exercise their aptitude in "understanding, thinking, judging, desiring, striving, contending, willing, doing"—which are the most strenuous activities of which mind and will are capable. By means of the new efficiency and the new strength imparted by the Holy Spirit—which is exactly the equivalent of Melanchthon's *adjuvante etiam Spiritu Sancto*, and of his *Spiritus Sanctus in nobis est efficax*—mind and will *assent* to the grace of God. Or, to put the whole case in Chemnitz's own words: "The Holy Spirit works conversion in the mind, in the will, and in the heart. For he causes that we will and are able to know, to think, to desire, to assent, to accept, to do, etc.," and: "It is certain that we will and do when we will and do." It is not God that wills either *in us* or *for us*. Neither is it God that believes *in us* or *for us*. Faith is the most inwardly personal, as it is the sublimest, act of the human mind and will. We cannot but ask Professor Pieper, whether he would be satisfied with the doctrine of the will and of conversion as the same is

presented in Chemnitz's *Examen*. It is essentially the old Lutheran doctrine.

4. We pursue the old Lutheran doctrine of the will still further. Jacob Andreae says in the third of his six celebrated sermons,* that "man is not a clod or a stone." In the Swabian Concordia, drawn up by Andreae in 1574, and signed by the theological faculty of Tübingen and by the members of the Stuttgart Consistory,† it is said: "But when the Holy Spirit, as already stated, through the word, *begins* to work in us and to impart to us the firstfruits of his gifts, then it is certain that we *also* and by such operation of the Holy Spirit, though in great weakness, *receive* and *have* in mind, heart and will, new spiritual gifts, powers, ability, virtue, freedom, faculty, movement, action."‡ (Italics ours).

In the Swabian-Saxon Concordia, prepared by Chemnitz and the Rostock divines in 1575, it is declared that "the will of man is not wholly like a block and a stone," and that conversion is not *per modum coactionis*, and that "in conversion there is indeed a great difference between the will of man and a stone or a block," and there is reproduced almost word for word, but in strengthened form as regards the three concurring causes, the passage quoted above from the Swabian Concord.§ And all this is retained word for word in the Torgau book of 1576.||

Thus it is certain that in the three documents named above the *activity* of the will in conversion is clearly recognized. In one of these documents it is declared that "the Holy Ghost is not given to those who resist, and that man is not converted *repugnativ*e. And so long as the whole man resists, conversion does not take place"—which, evidently, means that man must cease to resist, which cessation of resistance is as plainly an action of the will as is the resolution to hear and to meditate on the divine word. But in the Bergic Book of 1577 (Form

* Heppe. *Geschichte der Luth. Concordienformel.* Beilage I.

† Ibid., I., p. 41.

‡ Ibid., I., 101-2.

§ Ibid., I., Beilage II. 207-8.

|| Semler, 81-2.

of Concord) all this was supplanted by the following: "It is certain that conversion to God is the work of the Holy Spirit alone, who is the true author who alone works this in us. * * * The understanding and the will of the unregenerate man are nothing else than the *subjectum convertendum*. * * * In this conversion the will of man, the subject of conversion, does nothing, but merely suffers God to operate in it, until it is regenerated." And in the Bergic Book it is declared that the unregenerate man, though a rational being, "is like a pillar of salt; like Lot's wife; yea, like wood and stone; like a dead image." In a word, the doctrine of the will and of its relation to conversion as set forth in the Bergic Book, is, in tone, color and sense, very different from what it is in the other three documents named above. And as further proof of this we adduce the following facts: (a) The passage in the Swabian-Saxon Concordia, which declares that conversion does not take place where the person "does not apply himself to grace, but only resists the word" (Pfaff, p. 504), is retained in the Torgau Book (Semler, p. 94), but is exchanged in the Bergic Book for: "Is not made susceptible to grace by God." (b) In the Swabian Concordia and in the Torgau Book appear Melanchthon's formulas, as follows: "God draws, but he draws him who is willing; only will, and God anticipates;" and: "In conversion the will of man is not inert, but does something;"* which are explained thus: "This is not to be understood of the natural unconverted will of man, as if the will of man before his conversion has of itself so much power that before the *beginning* of its conversion it can coöperate, for it is dead unto good; but of the will which the Holy Spirit through the word has *begun* to convert and to guard." (Italics ours). In the Bergic Book it is declared: "Since such expressions are introduced contrary to the doctrine of the grace of God, for the confirmation of the false opinion respecting the powers of man's free will in his conversion, we hold that they do not correspond to the form of sound doctrine; and accord-

* Heppe, *Text der Bergischen Concordienformel etc.*, p. 67. Semler, p. 96-7.

ingly when conversion to God is mentioned, they ought reasonably to be avoided."

The Swabian-Saxon Concordia and the Maulbrun Formula were laid before an assembly of theologians at Torgau, May 28th-June 7th, 1576. Out of these two documents, Chemnitz, Selneccer, Chytraeus, Musculus, Körner, Andreae and twelve others composed the Torgau Book, and declared in the preface to the same that their Explanation* is out and out in harmony, both in words and in sense, with the Augsburg Confession, the Apology, the Smalkald Articles, and Luther's Catechisms—hence, in their estimation, a repetition of the old Lutheran doctrine; and they say in their closing paragraph: "In the presence of God and of all Christian people, both those now living and those who shall come after us, we wish to testify that this Explanation of the controverted articles, and no other, is our faith, doctrine and confession, in which we also, by God's grace, with undaunted hearts wish to appear and to give our account at the judgment seat of Jesus Christ. To whom be praise, honor and glory, world without end. Amen."† Signed by Andreae, Selneccer, Musculus, Körner, Chytraeus, Chemnitz.

Now, it is well known that within less than twelve months these same six men had transformed the Torgau Book into the Bergic Book; that is, into the Form of Concord, and had forsaken the old Lutheran doctrine of the will and of conversion, which, in its essential features, they had only a little while before sought to deliver again to the Church as in perfect harmony with the old Lutheran Confessions, and "as their own faith, doctrine and confession." But now all this is renounced and denounced as "not according to the form of sound doctrine, but contrary to it * * * and to be justly avoided." The human will, which they had repeatedly denied to be like a block or a stone, is now declared to be worse than a block or a stone, and man is declared "to be altogether passive in his conversion," and "the understanding and will of the unregenerate man are nothing else than the *subjectum convertendum*."

* Semler, p. 16.

† Semler, *ut supra*, p. 322.

So complete and radical a change of "faith, doctrine and confession," in so short a time, has scarcely ever occurred in the Church. The doctrine which had existed in the Lutheran Church for almost half a century is now set aside, and Melanchthon, who to the latest day of his life had avowed his adherence to the Augsburg Confession, and to the Apology, is ignored in the Form of Concord; and in a letter* to the Elector, written March 14th, 1577, by Andreae, Chemnitz and Selneccer, almost all of Melanchthon's writings are denounced as "erroneous," and as "questionable, or as expressly contrary to the truth"—all of which was done at the behest and to the behoof of the Flacianists, who, as regards the doctrine of the will, were Manichaeans rather than Lutherans.

Had the triumvirate found that the Torgau Book was acceptable to the Flacianists, then Professor Pieper would have had a different standard of orthodoxy, and things might be different in the American Lutheran Church, for it is an undeniable fact that the greatest schism that has ever occurred in the American Lutheran Church has resulted from differing interpretations of Articles II and XI of the Form of Concord. Professor Pieper's *Lecture* is a well-meant attempt to heal that schism. But either he goes back too far, or he does not go back far enough, in his effort to heal the Lutheran schism on the subjects of conversion and predestination. By a single bound he leaps over modern theology, and over the *intuitu fidei* of the Dogmaticians, and plants himself on the Form of Concord as the final standard of Lutheran orthodoxy, and places that over against Melanchthon as the chief offender. His antipathy to modern theology is almost a *rabies*. The *intuitu fidei* he has ignored, and his treatment of the Scripture is both partial and superficial. As a consequence, he has contributed nothing of value towards the solution of the question, *Cur alii prae aliis?*

In our humble judgment Professor Pieper would have acted more wisely had he confined his discussion to the teaching of

* Hutter, *Concordia Concordia*, p. 118, *et seqq.*

the Augsburg Confession and the Apology on the doctrine of the will, and to the later Lutheran and Melanchthonian teaching on the means of grace, and on predestination, since the theological *Spitzfindigkeit* of the Form of Concord is ill adapted to assist in settling any doctrinal question, unless it is to be settled *dogmatically*, for, to say nothing about the scholastic subtlety of much of its reasoning, it is a book of compromises, and of parts not always consistent in propositions and conclusions. Consequently it furnishes the occasion for disputes among those who profess to subscribe it with the belief that it puts an end to all theological controversy.

But most of all should Professor Pieper have gone back of modern theology, back of the dogmatists, back of the entire Book of Concord, back of Luther and Melanchthon, to

THE WORD OF GOD.

Here he will find at least two propositions about conversion, which he should consider in their relation to each other. The first is that conversion is pre-eminently a work of divine grace. The second is that conversion is an action of man, or at least includes an action of man.

1. That conversion is a work of divine grace is taught already in the Old Testament, where God promises a new heart, and where the saints express their longings for a new heart. "I will give them a heart to know me, that I am the Lord," Jer. 24 : 7. "I will put a new spirit within you; and I will take the stony heart out of their flesh, and will give them a heart of flesh," Eze. 11 : 19. "Create within me a clean heart, and renew a right spirit within me," Ps. 51 : 10. In the New Testament the new birth is represented as a work of the Spirit: "Except a man be born anew" (margin: *from above*); "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit," John 3 : 3, 5; and the Christian life is represented as a deliverance from death: "When we were dead through our trespasses God quickened us together with Christ," Eph. 2 : 5. "Being dead through your trespasses and the uncircumcision of your flesh, you did he quicken together with him," Col. 2 : 13; and everything is

ascribed to grace: "By the Grace of God I am what I am," 1 Cor. 15:5. Compare 1 Cor. 4:7; and repentance is said to be a divine gift: "To give repentance to Israel, and remission of sins," Acts 5:30. "To the gentiles also hath God granted repentance unto life," Acts 11:18. "If peradventure God may give them repentance unto the knowledge of the faith," 2 Tim. 2:25; and the entire work of salvation is ascribed to God: "By grace have ye been saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, that no man should glory," Eph. 2:8.

This class of passages seems to take salvation entirely out of our hands, and to place it exclusively in the hands of God. But there is a class of passages addressed to man, in which he is required to *do* something, and is described as *doing* something.

2. Repentance and faith are *required* of man as *acts* which he can perform. "To-day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts," Ps. 95:75. Here a demand is made upon those who hear the word of God. If man has no ability to harden his heart, then to command him not to harden it, is worse than superfluous. But the ability to do a thing implies the ability to choose not to do it.

"Let us give diligence to enter into that rest," Heb. 4:11. This is an exhortation, and every exhortation implies freedom of choice and action. Repentance is *required* of man as something he *can do*, and as a *conditio sine qua non* of the forgiveness of sins, Acts 2:38. The word *metavola* expresses mental direction. The *terminus a quo* is man's knowledge of himself; the *terminus ad quem* is God. "Repentance toward God," Acts 20:21. It involves the two-fold act of turning from sin and of accepting God as our portion. Hence it is an ethical and religious act; and whatever may be the causes that have produced it, or the motives that have inspired it, or the antecedents that have led up to it, repentance itself is the soul's own action.

Repentance is *described* as something that man *can do* and *must do*. "Repent ye," to which is joined: "Believe in the

gospel," Mark 1 : 15. "Except ye repent, ye shall in like manner perish," Luke 13 : 3. "Repentance is also joined with turning. "Repent ye therefore and turn again, *ἐπιστρέψατε*, "to turn about, turn back," Acts 3 : 19, and is used with reference to "turning from idols," with a purpose of "serving a living and true God," 1 Thes. 1 : 9. "They turned to the Lord," Acts 9 : 35. "Bring you good tidings, that ye should turn from these vain things unto the Lord," Acts 14 : 15. In all these places repentance is represented and commanded as something that men can do and should do, after they have heard the gospel. In 1 Pet. 2 : 25 this *turning* is clearly represented as a voluntary act: "For ye were going astray like sheep; but are now returned (*ἐπιστράφητε*) unto the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls."

Believing is described as an *act*, and is enjoined. *Πιστεῖς* is derived from *πεῖσθαι*, which means *I persuade, I induce one to believe*. In the passive and middle form it means *to be persuaded, to be induced to believe*, Luke 16 : 31; Acts 17 : 4; and also *to yield to, to obey*. Hence faith, considered according to its etymology, is a conviction that is wrought in us, but is also an action of the consciousness by which we are forced to surrender ourselves to something, to confide in something, and to obey something—not by constraint, as consciousness testifies, but by intelligent choice. *Πιστεύεις* involves an act of the intellect, and means primarily to think to be true, to be persuaded of, to place confidence in. In the New Testament it is used of "the conviction and trust to which a man is impelled by a certain inner and higher prerogative and law of his soul." In the New Testament we are commanded to exercise this prerogative, to obey this law of the soul: "Believe (*Πιστεύετε*) in the gospel" (Mark 1 : 15)—which evidently means, put your trust in the gospel, which can be done only by an act of the intellect, which discerns the gospel, and by an act of the will, which commits the soul to the gospel. The command was given to the Philippian jailor: "Believe on the Lord Jesus," Acts 16 : 31, where the grammatical construction enforces the idea of an action of the will. Of common occurrence are the forms

Πιστεύειν εἰς Ἰησοῦν, πιστεύειν εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, which have the sense of giving one's self up to, and which also by their grammatical construction tell of action.

To command a person to repent and to believe, on the pre-supposition that he has no power to repent and to believe, is hypocritical mockery; and every person who repents and believes is conscious of a psychical action which is his own, and for which he alone is responsible, whatever may have been the impulse or the assistance from without.

No doubt in every New Testament instance where repentance and faith are enjoined, the divine word and Holy Spirit are pre-supposed to be present, and to be active both in the mind and in the heart of the hearer of the divine word; but over against the word and the Spirit are set the mind of man with presupposed intelligence to discern the truth, and the will with presupposed ability to obey the truth, and also as having the ability to decline the invitation of the gospel, and to refuse the assistance of the Holy Spirit. "How often would I ($\eta\delta\acute{e}\lambda\eta\sigma\alpha$) have gathered thy children together * * * and ye would not" ($o\upsilon\eta\eta\delta\acute{e}\lambda\eta\sigma\alpha\tau\epsilon$) Matt. 23: 37—in which it will be observed that Christ employs the same identical word in regard both to his own willing and to that of man. And the same word is used by Christ when he says: "Ye will not come unto me, that ye may have life," John 5: 40.

These passages show that in conversion there is an action of man. But through all these passages Professor Pieper draws a broad line. The very thing which he charges against Melanchthon, but of which Melanchthon was not guilty, that very thing Professor Pieper does in the case of another class of passages. He ignores the entire body of passages that witness for man's activity in conversion. Hence, and for other reasons already given, the utterly unsatisfactory character of his *Lecture* as an effort to determine "the fundamental difference in the doctrine of conversion and predestination" in the American Lutheran Church. He has not reached the heart of the difficulty, which lies exactly at that point where prevenient grace touches the mind and heart and will of man. God is omnipotent. That is

a conclusion of reason and a teaching of Revelation. Man is free. That is a datum of consciousness and a teaching of Revelation. To reconcile these antinomies is a problem for theology. But until they shall have been reconciled, it is the duty of theology to recognize both as ultimate truths. As a science theology must subsidize philosophy and use her as hand-maid. As a science she must welcome truth from the Book, from Tradition, from the Progressive Consciousness of the Church. If she discards the Book she embarks on a wide sea of speculation. If she forsakes Tradition, she loses the goodly fellowship of the saints. If she ignores the Progressive Consciousness of the Church, she becomes obsolete and unfit for the Master's use. It is only when these three sources of Christian theology are held in right relation, and are employed in the proper measure, that the Christian religion, of which Christian theology is the science, can commend itself to the mind and heart and conscience of men.

ARTICLE III.

RELATION OF THE GERMAN EVANGELICAL SYNOD TO
THE PRUSSIAN UNION.

BY PROFESSOR J. L. NEVE, D.D.

I. *The interest in this question.*

The matter presented here has frequently been made a question for discussion, not only in America, but also in Germany. Does the Evangelical Synod of North America occupy the same position as the Prussian Union, and if not, what are the differences?

A few years ago this question received special attention, when during the Summer of 1898 the German Emperor made his journey to Jerusalem, with the intention of assisting in the dedication of the Church of the Redeemer. At the same time an invitation was given to the German Evangelical Lutheran Synod of North America by the High Consistory of Berlin to appoint a delegate to accompany the Emperor with other church dignitaries to the Holy Land. Rev. Dr. P. Menzel, of Richmond, Va., was chosen as the representative. Two years later the Evangelical Synod celebrated the golden jubilee of its theological seminary, Eden College, near St. Louis. Having formed the acquaintance of the German Emperor at Jerusalem, Dr. Menzel embraced the opportunity to inform His Majesty, who was then at Kiel, of the approaching jubilee. He expressed the wish of having the Emperor present, but if that could not be, the Emperor was requested to honor the Synod with some token of good will for the day of celebration. Emperor William therefore sent a congratulatory dispatch, which was published in their Synodical organ, *Der Friedensbote*.

The Evangelical High Consistory congratulated likewise and also donated a sum of money. In view of these tokens of friendship from Berlin, the men of the Evangelical Synod

have said over and over again: *The Evangelical Synod of North America is the legitimate daughter of the Prussian Union.* Whether this now is really so, one cannot answer merely by saying, yes, or, no. Whatever there is true in this, we shall in the following discussion admit and try to show. But a matter-of-fact discussion will reveal, that between the Evangelical Synod of North America and the Prussian Union, there are very marked differences.

II *A few words concerning the history of the Evangelical Synod in America.*

A Christian American by the name of Richard Bigelow was moved by the spiritual needs of the Germans in the vicinity of St. Louis, at that time called the "Far West," and consequently wrote to the Mission Institute at Basel asking for missionaries. Two men were sent in response to his call, *i. e.:* J. G. Wall and Joseph Rieger, who came from Germany in 1836. Mr. Wall organized a congregation in St. Louis and Mr. Rieger organized and served congregations near St. Louis and went up as far as Burlington, Ia. Another missionary from Basel, Pastor Ries, was already here. Other men of like tendencies, Nollau, Garlich, Heyer and Dauber, came from Barmen. These organized in Gravois Settlement, Mo., Oct. 15, 1840, what they called: *Deutschen evangelischen Kirchenverein des Westens.* The growth of this body was at first very slow, but soon a number of able men came from across the sea, among whom was Rev. A. Baltzer, who afterward became president of this body, and as such a prominent factor in its development. Quite an addition was made to the synod when in the year 1858 it received into its fellowship the *Deutsche evangelische Kirchenverein von Ohio.* This was followed in 1860 by the *Vereinigte evangelische Synode des Ostens.* Though these two bodies were very small numerically, nevertheless they helped a good deal by way of occupying new territory. In the year 1872 two other bodies were added: the *Evangelische Synode des Nordwestens* (called Hartmann's Synod) consisting of forty-eight ministers, and the *Vereinigte evangelisch-protestantische Synode des Ostens*, consisting of twenty-five ministers. Now the old title: *Deutsche*

evangelische Synode des Westens, was no longer suitable and was consequently changed by adopting the name: *Die Deutsche evangelische Synode von Nord-America*, which is its name at the present time. According to its Almanac of 1901 it numbers 909 pastors, 120 school teachers and 1129 congregations.

Its educational institutions are the theological seminary (Eden College) at St. Louis, Mo., which was founded in 1860. This institution has furnished the Synod 620 preachers and has at present an enrollment of 78 students. Its preparatory seminary is located at Elmhorst, Ill., which at the same time serves the purpose of a teachers' seminary. It is frequented by 95 students.

The most important publications of the Synod are: *Der Friedensbote* for the congregations and the *Theological Magazine* for pastors and teachers. These, with the synodical reports, and especially its constitution for the synod and the congregations, together with the catechism and liturgy, form the chief sources of information as to its theological standing.

III. *What are the characteristics of the Evangelical Synod?*

By far the majority of its pastors occupy the position of what is known in Germany as the *Positive Union*. Having read just now a biography of a well-known pioneer of this synod, written years ago by Inspector L. Haeberle, I must acknowledge here you find in reality the same piety in heart, the same consecration to service, the same spirit of self-denial, which is found in the Lutheran pioneers of America. And the other founders of the synod were men of the same spirit. Even Dr. Walther is said to have admitted that those pious men, who came over from Basel and Barmen, have been a fountain of blessing to this body, whose principles, on the other hand, he could not endorse. The Synod, too, as it developed, kept up relations with those institutions in the Fatherland, in which there was a living Christianity. There are connected with this body ministers who are strongly inclined toward the modern theology without the Synod itself opposing them, but the positive element is by far in the ma-

jority. That an outspoken negative theology is not tolerated in its seminary was proven years ago by the fact that a professor, who inclined that way, and who was much in favor with the students, was forced to vacate his chair. Thus it is a fact that the great majority of its preachers, though they are indifferent with reference to the doctrines that divide the two great churches of the Reformation, seek to advance true piety in their congregations.

Whether the Evangelical Synod of North America will be able to maintain this position remains to be seen. Indifferentism toward the doctrines of the Divine Word does not give very much assurance along this line. Let each man be fully assured in his own mind. As this is applicable to the individual Christian, it is still more so in the case of the Church, to whose care so many are entrusted. A church organization, which cares not whether its congregations adhere either to the Lutheran or the Reformed view of the sacraments, sets an example of indifference over against the truth of the Holy Scriptures in general. Experience, consequently, has shown that modern theology finds it comparatively easy to gain access into such an organization. Stahl in his book *The Lutheran Church and the Union*, and Wangemann in his *Una Sancta*, as also in the *Sieben Buecher preussischer Kirchengeschichte*, emphasize the fact that the school of Schleiermacher (the compromise-theologians), as also those theologians of liberal tendencies in general at that time, were so enthusiastic in their favor of the Prussian Union that they wished to see the doctrines of the Church become a question of contention in order that there might be made room for a reconstruction of the entire Christian faith. The Evangelical Synod likes to tell that orthodoxy was responsible for rationalism. We admit that it is not orthodoxy, as such, but rather its degeneracy, as, for instance, it found its exponent in Carpzov, which gave aid to the rise of rationalism, inasmuch as it made the Christian religion absurd by means of placing emphasis on the mere letter. But we affirm that pietism, not the pietism of Spener, but that sort which had no intelligent apprehension as to doctrine, and which afterwards found its

historical exponent in the Prussian Union, has contributed much more to the rise of that vulgar sort of rationalism than to that much more dangerous modern rationalism. Semler, the father of rationalism, was a pietist and adhered strictly to family worship. It is a fact worth while to ponder over, that neither Lutherans nor Reformed, who adhere to their confessions, are found to be rationalists, but that rationalism always goes hand in hand with indifferentism in regard to doctrine. It is therefore certainly not without foundation when it is feared by some that the modern-negative theology, if it ever should be destined to influence the German Synods of America, would first and easiest find open doors with the United Evangelical Synod of North America.

We are considering in this paragraph the characteristic peculiarities of the Evangelical Synod. There exists here in America between Lutherans of all tendencies and the Evangelical Synod a strained relation. In order to be clear on this point, it is not sufficient to point to the well-known zeal with which the Lutherans of strong confessional tendencies have fought against the principle of Unionism. If one wishes to understand this strained relation between the Lutherans and the Evangelical Synod, he must look at the situation in which our free church finds itself. Both work on the same territory where the congregations in many instances are close neighbors. A church organization is dependent on an increase of its membership for the sake of its existence. It is the policy which is pursued by the Evangelical Synod against which the Lutherans find constant cause to protest. Wherever a district Synod of the aforesaid body succeeds in finding a listening ear with Lutheran congregations, it courts them by saying that if they would unite with their Synod it would not involve a change of confession. If pastors from this Synod have in any way influence over lay members of the Lutheran Church, who have come from Prussian provinces to America, they will tell them as a rule: "With us you find the Church of your German home; between the Prussian State Church and us there is no difference." But they do not explain to them the real significant difference between

the absorptive Union, which is the real characteristic of their Synod, and a mere confederate Union, which characterizes the Prussian Union. A congregation belonging to the Prussian Union may remain Lutheran, and by far the overpowering majority of the congregations within the Prussian State Church are Lutheran in their entire make-up. A congregation on the other hand, which unites itself with the Evangelical Synod, becomes a member of a body, which in all its official documents (Synodical and congregational constitutions, liturgy and catechism) has blotted out the doctrinal differences between the Lutheran and the Reformed. We will readily admit that there are within the Prussian Union groups of congregations, which in reality occupy exactly the same position as the Evangelical Synod of North America, for instance the Garrison Church in Berlin and such congregations, which, since by order of the government of 1817, were organized as union or concensus congregations. But between these and the congregations of the Pomeranian province, which have had granted to them their Lutheran confessions, there is a great difference. Yet those Lutheran immigrants from the provinces of Pomerania, Saxony, Brandenburg and Silesia are courted by the Evangelical Synod, which says: "Our Synod stands just like your Church in the Fatherland." Yea, even more: Inasmuch as the Evangelical Synod has among its confessional writings also the Augsburg Confession and Luther's Small Catechism (but the last-named does not serve as a text book for the young), the ministers of that Synod as a rule say to those immigrants, though they come from Mecklenburg, Bavaria, Hannover or Schleswig-Holstein: "Among us you can be Lutherans too; you can use the Lutheran catechism." But they don't say that according to Synodical resolution it is made the duty of every pastor to introduce their own catechism "as soon as possible." And this catechism is a production made up of the Lutheran and the Reformed (Heidelberg) catechisms into one book. It is this general policy on the part of the Evangelical Synod of North America about which the Lutheran Synods justly complain,

and right here we have the real cause for the strained relation which exists.

The responsibility in this matter I would nevertheless not lay at the door of the individual minister of this body. It is rather the unnatural Unionism, especially in our American free Church, which brings with it this much complaint of church-policy. The desire on the part of each separate organization to extend its borders, is exceedingly great. And he who is a member of a body, which is characterized by doctrinal indifference concerning the Lutheran and Reformed confessions, as is the case with the Evangelical Synod of North America, is strongly tempted not to state the real facts in the case, but to endeavor to become to the Lutherans a Lutheran, to the Reformed a Reformed, and to the United a Union Man, if only he can win a congregation.

We now approach the real answer to the question under consideration, viz: The relation of the German Evangelical Synod to the Prussian Union. Among the readers of this paper I have in mind such of our Lutheran Synods in this country as are quite well informed concerning the Evangelical Synod, but who are nevertheless not in a position to know the real points at issue and the characteristic differences between the two. And because of the complicated state of development of the Prussian Union, I must necessarily dwell at greater length on the latter point.

IV. *The Union of the Evangelical Synod of North America is precisely what the Prussian Union was intended to be according to the decree of the cabinet of 1817, but on account of the opposition on the part of the Lutherans in Prussia was never realized.*

The rulers of the House of Prussia since the times of the Elector John Sigismund were Reformed, but the people were almost exclusively Lutheran (*i. e.*, only 9 Reformed congregations in Silesia, 7 in East Prussia, etc.). This condition of things was considered by all the Hohenzollerns as an unsuitable relation between ruler and people, and consequently the constant endeavor to bring about a union between the two.

After attempts of this kind had always failed, because of the resistance of the people, Frederick William III, on the occasion of the Reformation Jubilee in the year 1817, thought the time had come to proclaim the Union. He issued that famed cabinet decree in which it was said that the Reformed Church was not to become Lutheran, nor the Lutheran to become Reformed, but that both were to constitute "a renewed Evangelical Christian Church." The public confession of this new evangelical church was to be "the principal points in Christianity, wherein both churches agreed" (*Consensus*); the doctrines of disagreement on the other hand (*Dissensus*) were considered "non-essential" and left to the conviction of the individual.

We shall see later on that the aim of this cabinet decree of 1817 had to be given up as a church-policy by the Government. In his 75th thesis Claus Harms had prophetically declared: "Through this marriage the poor maid, the Lutheran Church, is to be enriched. Do not commit this act over the bones of Luther. They will become alive, and then woe unto you." This word was fulfilled before 20 years had passed by. Over the attempt to introduce the Union, there arose unspeakable confusion, so that the Prussian Government saw itself forced to give up its course and turn in another direction.

But before we proceed discussing that contemplated Union according to the cabinet decree of 1817, let us look at the wording of the confessional paragraph of the Evangelical Synod. The reader will see that the Union of this Synod was exactly the same as the Prussian Union originally was intended to be: *The German Evangelical Synod of North America * * * accepts the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures, as contained in the Symbolical books of the Lutheran and Reformed Church, of which the principal ones are: The Augsburg Confession, Luther's Catechism and the Heidelberg Catechism, in so far as they harmonize with each other; but on those points on which they differ, the Evangelical Synod of North America adheres exclusively to those passages of Scriptures pertaining to such points and avails itself of that spirit of freedom which in such matters prevails in the Evangelical Church.*

Such an evangelical church, in which, through a spirit of indifference as to the doctrine and through a mere emphasizing in points of agreement, a neutral denomination is created, Frederick William III had in mind when he issued his cabinet decree of 1817. And in order that he might succeed in the face of any confessional consciousness that might in all probability make itself felt, he pursued the following course. (1) Both the Lutherans and the Reformed were placed under one and the same church-government, which had been essentially the case already since the year 1808. (2) A general Liturgy for the use of the Lutherans and the Reformed was prepared, the principal work of which was done by the King himself. At first the use of this liturgy was recommended, but soon its use was made obligatory. (3) By a decree of 1823 the subscription to the unaltered Augsburg Confession and the Concordienformel was nullified; but on the other hand they were called upon to subscribe to "the confessional writings of the United Evangelical Church in so far as they agreed with each other." (4) In the year 1822 it was declared that those candidates for the ministry, who would subscribe to the so called "Union-revers," *i. e.*, a written declaration at their examination to submit to the Union arrangements, were to receive appointment with Lutheran as well as with Reformed congregations. Later on (1830), without considering such a written "revers," it was determined that pastorates of the State-Church should be supplied with pastors, no matter whether of Lutheran or of Reformed persuasion, in case the congregations themselves would not raise objections. (5) In the city of Bonn a theological faculty was constituted on the Union principle. The organization of "mixed congregations, which would constitute themselves on the consensus of both confessions," was everywhere encouraged. (6) The *Generalsuperintendenten* and the *Superintendenten* received instructions to see to it that the congregations would give up their distinguishing names, Lutheran and Reformed, and simply call themselves "evangelisch." (7) The custom of breaking the bread at Communion was made the outward sign of adopting the Union. Stahl says: "Thus the

movement to constitute a united, undistinguishable evangelical church was advancing with marvelous rapidity. Only one thing was lacking to make it complete: an official declaration that the entire State-Church was standing on the foundation of an undistinguishable evangelical confession. But unexpectedly the whole intention was essentially altered in consequence of the unlooked for opposition of Lutheran consciousness, which was considered as having wholly died out, and which now showed itself with a warmth and energy ready to stake all."

With this Union, as it was originally contemplated by Frederick William III for Prussia, the Union of the Evangelical Synod of North America harmonizes in principle. If this was already made clear to us by quoting their confessional paragraph, it will even be made more so by examining their official publications, especially the liturgy and the catechism. In the liturgy, which from their standpoint must be considered an excellent work, the consensus of both confessions, in the prayers for Reformation day and especially in the formulas for the administration of baptism and the Lord's Supper, has found expression in an exceedingly skillful manner. The same may be said of their catechism. This work, the casting together of the Lutheran and Heidelberg catechisms, which has never been attempted by even the most zealous advocate of the Prussian Union, shows with what consistent determination the Evangelical Synod of North America has pursued this Union principle, and to what extent it is true that the Lutheran and Reformed churches become extinguished, and that in their stead an undistinguishable evangelical church, a new denomination, has been created. It is therefore expected that congregations, which unite themselves with the Evangelical Synod, give up their distinguishing names "Lutheran" or "Reformed" and simply call themselves "Evangelisch."

When one remembers that a Union as represented by the Evangelical Synod of North America was the aim of the Prussian church-policy and that the Prussian King, in the capacity of Summus Episcopus, as also the church-consistory, which car-

ries out the King's ideas, beheld the partial failure of their Union project with regret, then the tokens of friendship manifested in Berlin toward the Evangelical Synod are easily accounted for. It was tantamount to a public confession that an absorptive Union, like the one in America, would have been for Prussia the real desirable thing, and that a party which represents this Union is looked upon with special favor is easily accounted for. But these tokens of friendship dare not be taken as a proof that the Evangelical Synod of North America and the Prussian State-Church are essentially alike. That this is not the case, will be seen in the following paragraphs.

V. *Since the re-awakening of the confessional consciousness, efforts have been put in motion by the Lutherans in the Prussian Union, which have never been made within the Evangelical Synod, and which would not be possible.*

The prophecy of Claus Harms was fulfilled. At a celebration in Silesia in memory of the presentation of the Augsburg Confession in 1530, "Luther's bones became alive." Scheibel, Professor of theology in Breslau, opposed the Union and refused to use the Liturgy. He was then suspended, and with 250 families he left the State-Church. The movement increased constantly. Those that had left the State-Church were persecuted with imprisonment and fine, but the martyrdom brought fresh fuel to the once awakened Lutheran consciousness, and the sparks flew into the neighboring provinces. Missionaries from among those that had separated themselves visited the congregations in Silesia, Brandenburg, Pomerania and Posen, and enlightened the congregations through speech and writings regarding the difference between the Lutheran Church and the Union. This took effect especially with the earnest believers in the congregations. With their scruples they came to their pastors, and these, in order to be able to answer the questions of their parishioners, were forced to study the long forgotten confessions. In addition to this, just now many societies of Pietists, true believers, took a more confessional stand. This awakening of a Lutheran consciousness, which was started by the movements in Breslau, without identifying itself therewith,

is very lively portrayed in a recently published *Denkschrift der lutherischen Vereins*. In this we read: "Especially the great mission festivals which were celebrated in those days with ever increasing interest and which were attended by people coming many miles with songs of praise upon their lips, became in the hand of God the spiritual hearth, upon which the holy fire of a new life and a living Lutheranism was kindled. And when after the close of these richly blest services ministers and laymen yet remained together in a small circle, then soon the conversation turned upon Church and Symbol, Union and Confession. Then followed questions and answers, a friendly discussion and a peaceable understanding concerning the Union as to whether it was to become negative or positive, absorptive or conservative, or if it had become so already, whether the Lutheran Confessions in the Union were to retain their authority, whether the Lutheran Sacrament would remain unaltered, whether Lutherans might with a clear conscience use the new liturgy and remain in the State-Church, etc. Thus often in the love of Christ there was a wrestling and fighting, a sighing and praying, till the new day began to dawn. And in this way the number of those, to whom the worthy maid of the Lutheran Church was dear, and who were prepared to use their best powers in order to build up the broken walls, increased daily. And it is wonderful how quickly these Lutherans found each other and united themselves together, a solid phalanx of brave champions for the Lutheran Confessions and the Lutheran Church."

The Prussian province of Pomerania above all became the hearth of these movements, whose aim it was to save the Lutheran Church within the Union. The congregations at Wallin and Camomin were the first to whom the assurance from the Consistory was given that they were "now, as before, Lutheran congregations, with whom the Confessions of the Lutheran Church were to remain intact and that their ministers were authorized to preach the Word of God and to administer the sacraments in conformity with these Confessions." The use of the formulas pertaining to the sacraments were made

optional. Many other congregations obtained the same privilege. The number of those loyal to the Confessions increased. Conferences were held in the home of a nobleman by the name of v. Thadden, attended by men such as Otto, Meinhold, Wetzel, Knaak, Wangemann, Ahlfeld, Besser, Nagel and Hengstenberg. On farmer-wagons with hayracks, drawn by four horses, the guests were brought together from the surrounding stations at a distance of ten miles. Every room in the house, every loft, and even the barn-floor, was made use of to accommodate all the guests. Many a young gentleman had to sleep on a bed of straw. At last Mr. v. Thadden was obliged to build an extra hall in order to make room for the participants. On the programme of these conferences, which lasted often several days, the burning questions: "Union, Lutheranism, Confessions, formed the leading topics. And the brethren thus brought together wrestled before the face of the Lord in all brotherly sincerity, though frequently the minds clashed together. They sought earnestly to know the truth and get clear in their minds concerning these questions which stirred their consciences to the very depths. And over these gatherings there hovered such a spirit of consecration, and they were so richly blessed by the deep spiritual sermons and devotional addresses, that all the participants left greatly edified, deeply affected and their minds cleared up. Two great conferences were held in the years 1843 and 1844. The result of these conferences may be summed up in these words: *We have indeed Union-attempts, but no Union-Church!*

A number of the participants of these conferences joined in later years the party that left the State Church, *i. e.*, Nagel, Besser and Mr. v. Thadden; but most of them remained in the State Church and became, under the leadership of Superintendent Otto in Naugard, 1848, the founders of the Lutheran Society of Pomerania, a society which, because of its definite demands, has accomplished unusually much for the Lutheran cause of this province. Similar societies were organized in Silesia, Posen, Saxony, Brandenburg, Westphalia and Prussia. The Society in Silesia adopted the following declaration: "We

constitute ourselves on the basis of the Unaltered Augsburg Confession. We intend to maintain, even within the Union, the rights accorded to our Lutheran congregations by the church government with all means at hand. For these, on account of the ambiguous relation with the Union, have become obscure." Among the leading men of this society were the Professors Kahnis and Oehler. The Lutheran Society for the province of Saxony issued on the day of its organization, April 19th, 1849, the following declaration: "To strive faithfully to maintain the Lutheran Church within the Prussian State Church and defend her confessions, her principles of government and her specific character against every illegal approach of the Union!" Of this declaration the King was notified.

All these Societies united themselves Sept. 9 11, in Wittenberg, into a Central Society. Fifty delegates from the different provinces assembled together in the old Luther-town. As a mark of their belief they drew up five theses, which are known as the *Wittenberg Sentences*, and which form a well-known part of Prussian church history, and are considered this very day the Programme of those Societies. We give them here:

1. We stand on the Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church.
2. We are convinced that our congregations have never rightly ceased to be Lutheran congregations, and that we are in duty bound to defend their confessional rights with all our might.
3. The Confessional rights of the Lutheran congregations demand for their safeguards a confessional church polity. Accordingly we ask for recognition and a carrying through of the Evangelical Lutheran Confessions in cultus, congregational constitutions, and government.
4. As the first aim of our endeavor we mention the liberation of the altar service from all ambiguity and a full expression of our confessions in the entire divine service. Further, a guarantee of our confessional independence in the administration of the church government. And finally the preservation of Lutheran principles in our congregational constitutions.

5. These ends we do not wish to reach by way of leaving the State Church, because we feel bound in conscience to carry this fight for the good rights of our Lutheran Church through upon her own territory within the State Church.

Wangemann writes in his *Sieben Buecher preussischer Kirchengeschichte*: The Lutheran Societies constituted at the beginning of 1850 an imposing power; 400 to 500 ministers, for the most part it may be said the best men, advised by experienced jurists, supported by a small but faithful band of Christian patrons, proved themselves loyal in bearing witness to the truth before the eyes of the government and their congregations during the year 1848.

And not only at that time but even to this very day, they are the men, who, with a definite purpose in view, go forward. During the year 1899, Sept. 5th, they celebrated their fifty years' jubilee, on which occasion the principal address had for its subject: "How far have those ends, which were aimed at in the Wittenberg Programme by the Lutheran Society, been reached, and what are the problems yet to be solved?" The most important organ of the society is the *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung* founded by Hengstenberg; also the *Konservative Monatsschrift* and the *Beweis des Glaubens* are publications of great influence. Among the leaders of these men we mention the Professors: Zoeckler, Haussleiter, v. Nathusius, v. Schultze and the pastors, P. Holtzhener, P. Koelling, J. Gensichen, Wetzell and Wolff.

At the close of this paragraph I will yet say that within the bounds of the Evangelical Synod of North America one hears nothing about such men as just mentioned. This synod bears the character of an absorptive Union in the most outspoken sense. If indeed one may speak of a prevailing element in it, it is by far the Reformed. Where a real Union between the Lutherans and Reformed has been effected—as Stahl correctly states—the results have been that whatever was specifically Lutheran was lost, and whatever was specifically Reformed remained. The Lutherans are always the losers, the Reformed have nothing to lose. Thus a Union like the Evangelical Synod of North America is naturally more of a Reformed character.

The Prussian State Church on the other hand bears, in spite of its unionistic mechanism, a preponderating Lutheran character, first, because the Lutherans are in the different provinces in an overpowering majority and secondly, because at those places where there are Reformed congregations the Union is only a confederate one. This is therefore in reality *one* difference between the Prussian State Church and the Evangelical Synod of North America: The first is preponderatingly Lutheran and the last Reformed.

VI. The essential difference between the Prussian State Church and the United Synod of North America will above all be seen, if one follows the historical development of the Prussian Union since the cabinet order of 1834.

In order to quiet the minds of the Lutheran people and put a stop to the spread of the separation from the State Church, there was issued another cabinet order in the year 1834. This read as follows: The Union does not aim at nor does it mean a giving up of the existing confessions of faith, neither is the authority, which these confessions hitherto have had, annulled. The adoption of the Union means only an expression of a spirit of moderation and toleration, which does no longer admit that the difference in some points of doctrine to which the other party holds, is a cause to refuse her the outward church fellowship. The adoption of the Union is a matter of free choice, and it is therefore a mistaken idea that the introduction of the renewed liturgy necessarily involves the adoption of the Union or was thereby indirectly effected.

From the wording of this cabinet order, compared with the one of 1817, one sees that a different course is to be followed. Was it at that time the founding of an undistinguishable evangelical church, in which there are no longer Lutheran and Reformed congregations as such, now "the authority which these confessions hitherto have had, is not to be annulled." In conformity with this declaration, those pastors of Pomerania received from the Consistory the assurance that—I repeat the sentence—"they were now as before Lutheran congregations, with whom the confessions of the Lutheran Church were to remain intact, and that their ministers were authorized to preach

the Word of God and administer the Sacraments in conformity with these confessions."

In a cabinet order of a later date (1852), to which we must afterwards refer in considering other points, the Evangelical High Consistory was authorized "to protect the right of the Lutheran Confessions." Further: In earlier years the ministry of ecclesiastical affairs in its decisions would always speak—much to the dissatisfaction of the Lutherans—about "tendencies (Richtungen) in the United State Church;" but at last in a Ministerial Decision of 1892 the Lutherans were recognized as a Lutheran Church in the following words: "The Lutheran Confessions and with them the Lutheran Church continue to exist unchanged in the Evangelical State Church." And again in 1896: "The introduction of the Union has altered nothing with reference to the Confessions, consequently the Evangelical Lutheran Church now as ever exists in the Evangelical State Church in the older provinces."

In accordance with these decrees it is in harmony when for instance in Pomerania in the call of a pastor the confessional standing of the congregation is mentioned, and that the pastor is expected to conduct his office in accordance with these confessions. In most of the other provinces, when pastors are installed in Lutheran congregations, they must obligate themselves to teach according to the Unaltered Augsburg Confession and Luther's Small Catechism and no Reformed Confession is mentioned. In all Lutheran congregations in the Prussian State Church the youth is instructed in Luther's Small Catechism.

The consciences of Lutheran pastors and congregations suffered most by the use of the United Liturgy. Those, who did not wish to leave the State Church and unite themselves with the independent congregations, did not cease complaining to the church authorities: "We can accept and use the liturgy, yet, in the administration of the Sacraments, the use of the old Lutheran formulas must be granted us." Many applications for the privilege of using these old formulas were made and granted. In accordance with a cabinet degree in 1857 the liturgy received even printed Lutheran formulas as an append-

age; but the use of the same was tied to an incommodious condition. It was therefore a joyful event for the Lutherans in the State Church of Prussia when in the year 1895 the new liturgy appeared with parallel formulas and when it was decided that every Lutheran congregation henceforth may use the Lutheran formulas. In this new liturgy there are formulas for baptism and communion, in which the pure Lutheran doctrine on the Sacraments is expressed. Thus the demand on the fourth of the Wittenberg thesis "a full expression of our confessions in the entire service" was granted.

Stahl says that the Prussian State Church was no Union Church but that it had Union elements in it. Such a Union element is found in the cabinet order of the year 1834 in the non-refusal of outward church-fellowship by one church body to the other, where the Lord's Supper particularly is had in mind. What sort of altar fellowship of the Lutherans with the Reformed this is, is described by pastor J. Gensichen in the *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung* as follows:

"That which is demanded by the Union of 1834 is nothing else than permission to receive the Lord's supper *as a guest*.

"1. The rule is that every communicant partakes of the sacrament with his own denomination, and only in exceptional cases of necessity, for instance *in agone mortis*, when the minister of such church, of which the sick person is a member, cannot reach him, or where the distances to a particular place are too great, desires the partaking of the Lord's Supper at the hands of a minister of another denomination. Such cases are in our Eastern Provinces very seldom. I have never, as long as I am in the ministry, had such a case, although there are in my congregation several Reformed families, which generally attend my services.

"2. The admission dare not be demanded as a matter of *right*, but is granted as a matter of *favor* and of free love. If for instance a Reformed would come to me and say: 'I consider your doctrine of the Lord's Supper as false, but you must nevertheless administer it to me,' or 'I can partake of the communion in my own church, but in order to show you that

the doctrinal differences are altogether unimportant to me, I will come to your communion table—I would not admit such a one as guest to our table. And, no doubt, I would be justified in refusing him, because of his false view already in this sacred matter.

"3. The Lutheran administration is not altered in the least because of the participation of a Reformed brother. The existing difference in the doctrine of the Lord's Supper is made plain beforehand, when he announces his intention to commune. And if then nevertheless he desires to partake of the sacrament showing a penitent, believing disposition, we admit him, but as a guest he must submit to our Lutheran usages."

A further union element the Prussian State Church has in its *church government*, which was organized in the year 1808. Everywhere, where Lutheran consciousness was awakened, pastors and congregations felt unhappy because of this arrangement, and in the different provinces, where Lutheran societies had been organized, but especially in Pomerania, attempts were made for the restoration of a purely Lutheran church government. But to accomplish this seemed to be impossible. On account of this many left the State Church and united themselves with the independent congregations, because they believed that not only the pure Word and the sacrament were essential to the idea of the Church, but also a Lutheran church government, which would see to it that the means of grace were administered rightly. The Lutherans of the State Church on the other hand, who, if it could be at all prevented, did not wish to leave the State Church, took the position that according to the seventh article of the Augsburg Confession, the pure Word and sacraments, were the signs (*notae*) of the true Church and that besides these the church government could not be considered a third sign. A Lutheran church government would indeed be very desirable, but it did not belong to "the esse but to the *bene esse* of the Lutheran Church." They pointed to the Reformers, who had declared themselves willing to submit to the government of the Catholic bishops, if they would only allow them to preach the gospel. Especially Wangemann in his *Una Sancta* proved that according to the usage of language in

the Lutheran Confessions "the rites and ceremonies instituted by men" (art. 7, Aug. Conf.) included among the first things church government. Inasmuch, therefore, as the Prussian Lutherans could not obtain a purely Lutheran church government, they endeavored to secure a guarantee for the continuance of the Lutheran Church from the government as it existed. A result of constant demands along this line was a cabinet order of the year 1852, in which a stipulation was made as follows: "The Evangelical High Consistory consists of members belonging to both churches, and if there is a matter that can only be decided according to one of the confessions, the primary confessional question (Vorfrage) is not to be decided by the vote of the entire body, but only by the vote of the members belonging to that side, and their decision is then made the basis for the vote of the entire body. Therefore, in matters pertaining to the Lutheran Church only those members of the High Consistory, belonging to that church are to decide." In the same document it is stated in one place that on the part of the church government the independence of both churches is to be guaranteed to them.

Stahl in his often quoted work, *The Lutheran Church and the Union*, closes his discussion about the history and the legal status of the Prussian Union in the following words: "In accordance with its general character the Evangelical State Church of Prussia is a *unique organism*, but this consists in its very centre and in its entire development of two confessions. The State Church of Prussia is not a union church. It has not a common evangelical confession, upon which as a state church it stands, but its basis is throughout the distinguishing confessions of the Lutheran and Reformed churches. It has no common organ and elements, but they are from first to last either Lutheran or Reformed. We mention the members of the higher and lower ecclesiastical authorities, the pastors and the congregations. It is a dualism through and through of two not united confessions. The Evangelical State Church is not a union church, but a church that has only union elements in it. As a state church it has only one union element in it, viz., the unique and yet not undistinguishable church government. But

each of her congregations and perhaps by far the greater part of them possesses another element of union in the non-refusal of the outward church fellowship with other confessions. *The State Church is therefore not a union church, but Lutheran or Reformed for either of the two confessions, which it contains.*"

VII. *We sum up with a closing word.*

1. The union of the Prussian State Church is merely confederative; the one of the Evangelical Synod of North America outspoken absorptive, or; the first is conservative, the latter radical.

2. The authorized confession for the Evangelical Synod is the consensus of the Lutheran and Reformed symbols, the dissensus is left optional. The authorized confessions of the Prussian State Church—since the cabinet order of 1834—are for the Lutherans, the Lutheran; and for the Reformed, the Reformed symbols.

3. For the Lutherans in the Prussian State Church Luther's Small Catechism is the authorized text-book, and for the Evangelical Synod an evangelical catechism—which is a combination of the Lutheran and the Heidelberg catechisms.

4. The liturgy of the Prussian State Church contains the parallel-formulas, pertaining to the sacraments for the use of the Lutheran congregations, which are by far in the majority and thus the opportunity and possibility for a complete Lutheran administration of the sacraments is given, whilst the Liturgy of the Evangelical Synod contains no Lutheran and Reformed formulas but only such, as are based on the consensus of both churches.

5. The altar-fellowship in Prussia, wherever it occurs, is one of privilege, so that the independence of each church remains intact, but with the Evangelical Synod of North America it is such that only one evangelical church is recognized.

6. In Prussia as a rule a pastor for a Lutheran congregation receives his ordination according to the Augsburg Confession and Luther's Small Catechism, the Evangelical Synod obligates its candidates to the teachings of the consensus of both confessions.

7. The church government of Prussia is divided into Lutheran and Reformed and is bound to maintain the independence of both confessions, the Evangelical Synod has only one undivided evangelical church government, which cannot take into consideration the special Lutheran interests.

8. The Prussian State Church has as a guard of Lutheran interests a strong element, which fosters in organized societies Lutheran sentiment and represents it through influential church-organs. Such an element would, under conditions as they exist in our free church in America, soon separate itself, because the real union tendency was lacking.

9. "Only a few elements in the State Church are united in the real and full sense of the word: the military congregations, the University at Bonn and a few so-called *consensus* congregations." With these the Evangelical Synod occupies essentially the same ground, but not with the actual main parts of the Prussian State Church.

The correctness of the foregoing statement by Stahl, which in a previous controversy with my evangelical friends, I had the chance to quote, was emphatically denied by them. Therefore, before I gave this manuscript to the printer, I sent it for correction to the chairman of the Lutheran societies, Pastor J. Gensichen, calling his attention especially to the foregoing ninth thesis. In his reply he kindly pointed out to me several small incorrect statements, which I have corrected, and said: "Thesis nine is correct, for that distinguished jurist Stahl never affirmed anything disputable."* It is also to be remembered that this statement is found in the second edition of his book, after the first edition had called forth a flood of replies. If the statement had been found to be untenable, he would certainly not have repeated it in the new edition. It must further be remembered that we have to deal with the question in how far, from a corporative stand-point, we can speak in Prussia of a

* The consent of the editor of the *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung*, who likewise read my manuscript, was an additional proof to me that I have succeeded in this discussion to portray the church affairs in Prussia correctly.

Union that has been carried out successfully in its government, creed and cultus, as we have it before us in the Evangelical Synod of North America. Such a Union Stahl denies and admits only union elements in the Prussian State Church. There may have been organized since Stahl's time, especially in Berlin, new organizations on the union-principles, but even that does not change the general character of the Prussian State Church, especially in the provinces, and even then these Union churches in Berlin use the Lutheran catechism, which has been officially done away with in America. Of course, as a tendency of thought (Geistesrichtung) the Prussian Union—this must be frankly admitted—is a power, and here above all are found the points of contact between the Union men in Prussia and in America.

ARTICLE IV.

THE CHRISTIAN ALTAR : ITS DEVELOPMENT, ABUSES, PLACE AND USE.

BY REV. W. L. RUTHERFORD, A.M.

Worship and the altar seem to be co existant and inseparable. The most ancient altars of which there is any record are those mentioned in the Bible. The first mentioned is that "built unto Jehovah" by Noah¹. Since sacrifice, however, implies an altar, there must have been altars for the sacrifices of Cain and Abel. We are repeatedly told of the altars built by Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, during their sojourn in Canaan. The most remarkable was the altar built by Abraham upon which he offered his son Isaac. Moses erected an altar at Rephelim, Ex. 18 : 15, and another accompanied by twelve pillars at Horeb, Ex. 24 : 4. Shortly after the Israelites left Egypt they were given directions by God, informing them how to build their altars, Ex. 20 : 24. At the appearance of the Levitical Ceremonial, altars much larger in construction, with a more elaborate ceremony, were instituted. The brazen altar

of the first temple was an immense structure, being about fifty feet square at the base and twenty-four at the top. The altar in the second temple consisted of a mass of masonry in proper form, but more simple, 1 Macc. 4:45-47. This altar, rebuilt by Herod, Josephus tells us, was fifteen cubits high and fifty cubits square at the base, and remained practically the same in form throughout the Old Testament dispensation.

The altar always has occupied a central place in worship. All through the Old Testament dispensation the worship on the part of God's people was sacrificial in its nature, the sacrifices all pointing to the great Sacrifice upon the Cross. But when Christ, in his last moments of suffering, exclaims: "It is finished," and gives up his spirit; and the veil in the temple is rent in twain from top to bottom, we have announced the termination of the Mosaic ceremonial dispensation. By these climacteric events upon the cross and in the temple, God abolishes the dispensation and the worship which were preliminary and introductory. The sacrificial element in worship is forever eliminated, and that form of worship abrogated in the completed atonement,—and a perfect salvation is wrought for men.

The sacrificial element, therefore, no longer obtains in the worship of God's people. We now enjoy a closer communion with God. "Having, therefore, brethren, liberty to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus; by a new and living way, which he hath now made through the veil, let us draw near with a true heart," Heb. 10:19. Through Christ's death we have fellowship with God. There is no intervening priest. We are all priests unto God. There are no obscure promises, for "all the promises of God in him are yea, and in him Amen, unto the glory of God by us," 2 Cor. 1:20. Weary rites and ceremonies are no longer necessary, for Christ has taught us that "God is a Spirit and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth," John 4:24. True worship, therefore, demands an altar from which the literal sacrificial element has been eliminated by the New Testament order and spiritual significance. Such is the conception and practice of the apostolic Church.

A look at the nature of the Church and her development under the peculiar existing conditions reveals the deep secret accounting for the introduction and existence of many innovations foreign to the teaching and spirit of the word, as well as to the conception and practice of the apostolic Church. The Church had two forces of influence bearing upon her. They were Judaism and Paganism. And in Judaism itself were the opposing elements of Phariseism and Essenism threatening schism and disaster. The Church has ever been warned against idolatry and its influence; and Christ, as if fearful of their influence on his Church, frequently warned his disciples against the "leaven of the Pharisees," Matt. 16:6.

The Church of Christ is highly syncretic in its nature and may be termed a syncretic organization. Almost all forms of lower religion found some form and place of expression in the syncretic tendency of the Church. Disguise it as men may, the worship of the relics of saints and martyrs is but fetishism. Thus the undue veneration of saints developed into that idolatry which was but a new application of ancestor worship. It is this syncretic nature of the Church that reached out to conciliate and cause a more rapid spread of Christianity by adopting many festal days, and the rites and ceremonies of the heathen world. This was very clearly seen at the time. "You have," says Faustus to Augustine, "substituted your Agapae for the sacrifices of the Pagans; for their idols, your martyrs, whom you serve with the very same honors. You appease the shades of the dead with wine and feasts; you celebrate the solemn festivities of the Gentiles, their Calends, and their Solstices and, as to their manners, those you have retained without any alteration. Nothing distinguishes you from the Pagans, except that you hold your assemblies apart from them."*

Indeed the Church seems to have gone frantic in her desire to appropriate symbolical acts in worship. "The fraternal kiss was a general custom throughout the whole period. On entering, the church door or threshold was kissed; during the litur-

* Draper, *Science and Religion*, p. 48.

gical service the priest kissed the altar, the reader the Gospel. Even relics and images were kissed. When one confessed sin he beat upon his breast. The sign of the cross was made during every ecclesiastical action and even in private life was frequently used. Sprinkling with holy water came into vogue about the ninth century. The burning of incense is first found late in the fourth century. In early times it was supposed to draw on and feed the demons; afterwards it was regarded as the surest means of driving them away. Processions are of early date, having their prototypes in the heathen worship in the solemn marches at the high festivals of Dionysos, Athene etc., etc."*

Already in the fourth century, when the Church was busy appropriating rites and ceremonies, forms and accessories, from Judaism and Paganism, among the most prominent and senseless was the introduction of the use of candles upon the altar. At mass, and "in other ceremonies, candles were used, and a symbolical meaning found. Thus the *baptism* candles spoke of the light of the good works by which heaven was entered; the *marriage* candles, of the purity and joy of the heart; the *burial* candles, of the eternal light of heaven."† The same authority shows the Candlemas, "to be a mere Christianization of an old Pagan feast celebrated in Rome, at the same season, in memory of Ceres searching after Proserpina."‡ Finding it impossible to conceive how men with their senses and under the light of the gospel can be given to such error of Paganism, we simply reply in the language of Lactantius 250-330 in his reference to the heathen on the subject, when he says: "If they (the heathen) would contemplate that heavenly light which we call the sun, they would at once perceive how God has no need of their candles, who has himself given so clear and bright a light for the use of man. * * * Is that man therefore to be thought in his senses, who presents the light of candles and torches as

* Kurtz, *Church History*, Vol. I, p. 379.

† Schaff-Herzog, *Candles*

‡ Schaff-Herzog, *Candles*.

an offering to him who is the Author and Giver of light?"* But a century later the Church appropriated those heathen candles with a flood of other abuses in her forms of worship.

When religion is so retrospective as to be buried in dead ancient forms and symbols, the result, if not retrogression, must be hampered, retarded progress. Christianity had become largely an *objective* religion. By paying undue reverence to the past, its forms of worship had stiffened into fetters. "A vast machinery of mediation—sacraments, priesthood, discipline, ritual—had been interposed between the individual soul and its God. Its face was towards the past. It demanded only precedents, it wanted no agitation, no discussion; it desired rest."† And so marked and universally acknowledged was this moral degeneration in those days of dead formal depravity, that in Providence when a person had reached about the lowest depths of depravity, he was said to be "viler than a priest."‡ The Church had grown rigid in her beliefs, and in defense of her false position she felt justified in using the arm of power; and her history verifies the remarkable fact that legalism and ecclesiastical austerity characterize the spirit and polity of those whose vision is focused by the optics of antiquated symbols and forms.

This is the influence, and such the development, that imposed much upon the Church that was foreign to her true polity and spirit. These ecclesiastical excrescences grew and multiplied until the Church groaned under its accumulated accessories and abuses, necessitating in the providence of God a Reformation for her relief and purification. Such is the development that brought and accompanied the changes, abuses and prostitution of God's altar.

The evolution of the altar is interesting. About the sixth century the simple apostolic altar serving as a communion table is removed, and the changing forms of abuse and perversion are substituted, until we are given the Roman Catholic altar of the sixteenth century and the present. It was the

* Schaff-Herzog, *Candles*.

† Draper: *Intellectual Development of Europe*, p. 433.

‡ Draper: *Op. Cit.*, p. 280 *et seq.*

heathenish veneration and worship of the saints and their relics that became the primal cause of the change in the construction and shape of the altar. Owing to this great veneration of saints and relics, the Eucharist was early brought into close relation with the tombs of martyrs. In the days of Constantine already it was considered a matter of great importance to bring the altar or table in the closest relation to the tomb of some apostle or martyr, usually locating the altar directly above it. The bones under the altar were viewed and rendered accessible by shafts and stairways leading to them. About the fourth century the floor was sunk so as to bring the altar into closer relation to the grave. "In St. Peter's the shaft was twice interrupted by perforated plates which were extended across it." Small objects, particularly handkerchiefs, placed on these plates, and thus brought in contact with the sacred tomb, acquired the character of relics. "These secondary relics were deposited in a cavity made in a plate of the altar."* Thus the altar or table moves downward and the relics upward.

The churches in the cities were placed at a great disadvantage having no martyr's grave over which to build their altars. During the sixth century the bodies of martyrs were translated and deposited within the churches of the city, except in Rome, where this was impossible until after the middle of the eighth century. The relics were commonly placed immediately beneath the plate of the altar. Hence the reconstruction of the altar which this required was very radical. "The relics were enclosed within a stone cippus which closely imitated the heathen pattern,"† bearing the appearance of a miniature tomb. Although this was placed beneath the altar plate, it did not entirely do away with the legs of the "Holy Table," or altar, but the legs are disappearing by the process of altar evolution, brought about by the direct influence of heathenism. This leads directly to the final step, in which "the altar was enclosed on all four sides by plates of stone and became a mere chest for the preservation of relics."‡ Hence, "the change of

* Lowrie, 163.

† Lowrie, 168.

‡ Lowrie, 167.

form which the altar underwent in the sixth century was due exclusively to the cult of relics, or rather to the new form that cult then took of enclosing the relics *within* the altar."†

In the middle ages the length of the altar was determined by the custom of enclosing a Sarcophagus, or a full extended body within the altar which gives us the regulation length corresponding to that of the human figure. It is also at this time that we note the rapid development of accessories and other abuses. In this process of evolution, which continued throughout the centuries the altar finds an elevated position of pre-eminence, and super-importance at the rear of the pulpit. Such is the style and character of the altar in the Roman Catholic as well as some of the Protestant churches to-day. And here we have the proof of the great fact that the Church is still highly syncretic in tendency, when we note, that even in this day of enlightenment, there are Protestant churches that reach out and appropriate the heathen altar, the forms and accessories of the dark ages, with the heathen candles included.

With this degenerate, retrogressive and degraded use of the altar goes the tendency and strong inclination to convert the ministry into an exclusive sacerdotal order, arrogating to its rank of self-appointed authority the right of mediation, priestly offerings, indulgences, confession, penances, work-righteousness, etc. And we are forced to acknowledge that many of the same demoralizing elements in religion which led to the corruptions of Rome remain, exerting an influence and augmenting a tendency of their own in a most positive and aggressive manner. Although this may be repudiated by such as have their faces turned thither, it remains an incontrovertible fact. And perhaps the strongest proof of this claim, so thoroughly substantiated by ecclesiastical history, is the minimizing of the importance, and the gradual silencing of the Word, by the interposition and substitution of rites and ceremonies and forms of service, which invariably accompany that degenerate development and unscriptural use of the altar.

It is true, we have the legitimate work of the Iconoclast in eradicating and destroying the useless accessories and abom-

† Lowrie, 160.

inable images that found their way in the Lord's house, but it must be candidly acknowledged that in many places, under the storm of a most radical reform, the Church lost much in her new attitude and condition. Many of the Reformed sects assumed a position of positive retrogression, out of which some are only now beginning to emerge. So exceedingly primitive and erratic have they been as to prefer groves, orchards, barns, etc., to a special house dedicated for divine worship. The very temple of God was demolished by them. Hence where God's house is brought thus low, or where the house by chance remains in its barrenness with the altar excluded, we have simply the sacrilegious wreckage of iconoclasm.

The altar, therefore, has its place in the Lord's house of worship as we shall fully demonstrate. If it has a place in the Protestant Church it must have a use and purpose. It must be a means to an end, in a true, high and spiritual sense in the divine economy of worship. There has been a place for the bread and wine, the elements of the Eucharist, upon the altar or table from the incipiency of Christ's Church. From this simple use of the altar in its relation to the Holy Communion, we find very early a rapid development of the sacrificial significance attached to both the elements and the altar.

Already in Paul's day the use of that divine and sacred ordinance, the Lord's Supper, was so abused that the apostle was led to castigate the Church with the strokes of his pen in his letter to the Corinthians. And early in the Christian era Appollonius, a martyr in the reign of Commodus (180-192), when called upon to sacrifice, replied: "As to sacrifices, I and all Christians offer a bloodless sacrifice to God." Tertullian also speaks of the Eucharist as "a sacrifice," "the sacrificial prayers," and of "standing at the altar of God."* Clement calls the Eucharist "oblation,"† and Cyprian, the brilliant and illustrious martyr, is full of such language; while Origen declares that "in the Eucharist we plead the death of Christ."‡

* *On Prayer*, 18, 19.

† *Stromata*, 1 : 19; 4 : 25.

‡ *Hom. on Jer.* XII, 3.

In a literal sacrificial sense in which these expressions seem to be given, they are in clear conflict with the apostolic conception of the Lord's Supper and its relation to the altar or table. The bread and wine used in the Eucharist are placed upon the table or altar of the New Testament spiritual conception and significance as an expression of the great Sacrifice "offered once for all" in Christ. Upon the altar of figurative and spiritual significance, reminding us of the altar where once the types of Christ foreshadowing his suffering and death were offered, there the elements of the Sacrament commemorating his death are not offered as a sacrifice in the literal sacrificial sense, but they are placed and consecrated for holy use in the sacrament by which we "show the Lord's death till he come." Hence the term altar is beautifully significant in its relation to the type foreshadowing the Antitype whose death the Eucharist commemorates; and in which is the real presence of the glorified Christ, and through which we receive his body and blood. The Christian's only altar for bloody sacrifice is the cross, Heb. 13:10, upon which our great High Priest offered himself for all, "one sacrifice for sins forever," Heb. 10:12, shedding his blood "for the remission of sins." The Lord's Supper, therefore, is not a sacrifice in a sacrificial or literal sense, but a sacrament in commemoration of a sacrifice—the sacrifice on Calvary. "As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come," 1 Cor. 11:26.

Another use of the Christian altar is for the offering of our sacrifices of prayer and praise and gifts of devotion. In this sense also, as an expression in worship, the Eucharist may bear the significance of a sacrifice in a figurative sense as indicated in the preceding paragraph, but only under the true apostolic, Christian and spiritual conception. This use is thoroughly legitimate and proper as verified by abundant proof throughout the entire history of the Church and the Word of God. Accordingly a place for sacrifice on the Christian altar, however, does not in any way include the idea of sacrificing for sin, but simply provides for an outward expression in worship. Just as the essential nature of an offering in the old economy, was "the

devotion of man to God expressed in an outward act,"* so the Christian's devotions are his sacrifices. The inward impulse which impels us to thank, praise and worship God is only fully satisfied when embodied in corresponding action. Our deeds must testify. "Faith without works is dead." "Let your light so shine," etc. Thus our acts and forms in worship should conform as fully to the spirit of worship as our actions in every day living should correspond with a true Christian life.

The foregoing symbolical interpretations may be considered too dangerously near the precipice of the idolatrous for those who have a strong tendency toward Rome, but so long as the view is Scriptural and in strict accord with the apostolic and true Christian conception, it is legitimate and safe. But when symbolism develops heathenward until it assumes the proportion of the golden calf at Sinai, which was worshipped as a symbol of Jehovah, Ex. 32 : 4-8, in due time God will burn and grind the image to powder, and compel his people to drink the sickening waters as a penalty. And when we unduly exalt what has been given for sacred use, and is associated with divine command and power, we are guilty of sacramentalism, and such accessories at once become unholy by their misuse and abuse. These God will destroy also, as did Hezekiah the brazen serpent, which he broke in pieces and called Nehustan —a mere "piece of bronze," 2 Kings 18 : 4. Likewise, when undue reverence is paid to accessories, to their symbolical and figurative meaning, it is the same tendency and spirit that led to the worship of Gideon's ephod, Judges 8 : 27 ; and to Micah's idolatry, Judges 17 : 5. The farther we get from the simplicity of worship and childlike praise, the farther we stray from the Word and the Spirit of Christ, who is our only guide.

Christ has nowhere indicated the abrogation of the altar, in that entire sweeping sense which includes the figurative and spiritual significance with the literal or Jewish conception. On the contrary he indicates its sacredness and importance, but always with that spiritual significance that is in full harmony

* Oehler's Old Test. Theol., Day, p. 261.

with his life, and also his doctrine, when he says: "God is a Spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." Shortly before his death, when rebuking the Pharisees, Christ incidentally reveals the pre-eminence of the temple over its sacred contents in the words: "Whether is greater, the gold, or the temple that sanctifieth the gold?" Matt. 23:17. And in reference to the altar he asks: "Whether is greater, the gift, or the altar that sanctifieth the gift?" Matt. 23:19. And in the Sermon on the Mount we have the most beautiful and unmistakable reference by Christ sanctioning the use of the altar for the sacrifice of gifts. It ought to be sufficient for all time to hear our Lord tell us: "Therefore if thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee; leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift," Matt. 5:23-24. What might be claimed to be simply the use of a Jewish custom by Christ to enforce the lesson of Christian reconciliation is significantly promulgated and put into practice by the apostles. This doctrine is most beautifully presented in the Epistle to the Hebrews: "Through him therefore let us offer up a sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of lips which make confession to his name. But to do good and communicate forget not, for with such sacrifices God is well pleased," Heb. 13:15. And in referring to the gifts received from Epaphroditus, they are called, "a sacrifice acceptable and well pleasing to God," Phil. 4:18. The frequent reference by John to the altar in the Apocalypse is also more than significant.

Christ has not only given us the Word and instituted the two sacraments for our worship and growth in grace, and the promotion of his kingdom, with the commission, "Go teach all nations, baptizing them," etc., and "Do this in remembrance of me," but he reveals his high regard for the temple by his cleansing it twice and also the significance and sanctity of the altar in his most pertinent reference to it. With this thought we must always hold in view the fact that Christian architecture, the temple and its belongings, must be in strict accord with the

spirit and worship under the new economy in the Church as instituted and established by Christ.

The Christian basilica, consecrated by centuries of Christian worship, was admirably adapted to the Church's service. Although it is to be traced back to the "private house and to the simple cult of the disciples who gathered there during the age of persecution, no Christian monument is more venerable, none more inseparably associated with the history of the Church."^{*} "Between the *tablinum* and the open part of the *atrium*" (which were near the center of the building), "stood an ornamental stone table. It is a very striking fact that this is precisely the position of the Holy Table in the basilica."[†] Lowrie not only admits a great "similarity of many of these tables with the most ancient altars," but under his description of the ancient altar he says, "it was also commonly called a table." This is in strict accord with the Word, which uses the terms altar and table for the same thing interchangeably.

The early altar or table was built so as "to permit free passage around it."[‡] When altars began to multiply in number, "the high altar stood out by itself in the middle of the choir recess."[§] When the "conception of the altar as the common table was still preserved," we find the "position of the altar between the priest and the people."^{||} The room of the clergy, called the *presbyterium*, raised on a platform of several steps, occupied the place at the front of the *auditorium*. "A few steps led from the middle of it into the choir. The chancels of the presbyterium coincided with the chord of the apse, and the altar stood upon a line with them. The approaches therefore had to be constructed on either side of the altar."[¶] The pulpit found its place to the side of the choir. In the catacombs and early basilicas the bishop sat by the tomb, or the altar, or table.

^{*} Lowrie, 89.

[†] Lowrie, 100.

[‡] Lowrie, 167.

[§] Kurtz, Church Hist., Vol. I, p. 520.

^{||} Lowrie, 46.

[¶] Lowrie, 169.

His chair was his pulpit. Later he stands back of it, when the altar stood "between the priest and the people," and when the *ambon* or pulpit came in use. It is a strange "modern practice which has reduced the altar of the Church to a mere shelf against the wall."*

Those who advocate the modern shelf-altar in the Protestant Church hold that the altar railing, if it does not serve as a barrier, bears that significance. This, however, is nothing more than a forced interpretation to coincide and harmonize with the theories and symbolism of our modern shelf-altar advocates. Hence the objection on the part of such seems to be urged against a railing at the place of its usefulness, in front of the chancel, while a strange fancy leads some to prefer an enclosure of the altar to the wall as proper. This is a Romish vagary, and carries with it a foreign and unscriptural significance—one that is naturally in harmony with the strange symbolism and ecclesiastical projection of the modern shelf-altar of Barbarico-Jewish origin, declaring a separation of the holy priest from the common people. Such a conception and practice cannot be tolerated consistently within the pale of a true Protestant Church which holds and teaches the doctrine of a "Universal Priesthood of Believers," since, according to God's word, "we are all priests unto God." It is true, the altar-railing may not be essential, and absolutely demanded as a necessary accessory to worship or altar service, but we must candidly acknowledge it to be exceedingly helpful in its use at the baptismal and confirmation services. Its support and convenience to those kneeling, especially women, render it especially useful as an accessory; and if useful in a convenient and proper rendering of the important ceremonies for baptism and confirmation, it is surely appropriate. It is the use of the table or altar and the pulpit, etc., that makes them appropriate. The greater the use the greater the importance of any accessory in worship, and consequently the more appropriate; and correspondingly prominent also should be the position and relation to other church furniture.

* Lowrie, 46.

But the reredos, sacristy, crucifix, candles, varied altar-cloths, and all other inconsistent paraphernalia have no place accorded them as proper accessories to God's altar. There is no scripture authority, either direct or indirect, for them. The whole tenor and teaching of the Scriptures, as well as their attendant results in their effect upon the spiritual life and development in worship, most positively forbid their use.

Viewing the Church of Christ in many quarters appropriating such forms and accessories which by their fruits prove their death-working influence upon spirituality, with a consequent detriment upon the Church, we are given repeated and substantial proof of the dangerously syncretic tendency of the Church, as well as the sure incontrovertible fact that, a broken law of God must maintain its high inviolability by the execution of the penalty. This penalty the Established Church of England is paying to-day in the growth of popery within her walls, as is every other Church in proportion to such retrogression. To substantiate this statement we have but to refer to a protest by a London church to the Lord Bishop appearing in the *Doncaster (Eng.) Chronicle*, of Feb. 21st, 1898, from which we quote the following :

"Among the idols in our parish church there are three large crucifixes and other smaller, abominable idols of that sort, also an image called a 'Madonna and Child.' We have seen superstitious reverence paid to several of the idols. During public worship last Sunday morning we saw an official light up an assortment of eighteen candles before the so-called 'Madonna and Child.' There is also a crib with a number of stone images in it; here there are kneeling mats, and we saw a person ceremonially bow to this image crib. The church is also furnished with vessels containing so-called 'holy water.' The service last Sunday was prefaced by the curate parading the church with a basin containing this so-called 'holy water' and sprinkling most of the people present with a small mop.

"At the communion service the curate turns his back upon the people throughout. The thing which the clergy call 'the altar' is the object of ceremonial bowings and crossings; it is

ornamented with showy tablecloths, whereof the colors are changed according to papal 'use.'

"Candles are put on 'the altar,' and, although they are not needed for the purpose of giving light, are burnt.

"The clergy and the choir and some of the people ceremonially bow to their pretended 'altar.' The so-called 'priest' openly announces beforehand that 'mass will be celebrated' at such a day and hour, and when that ceremony occurs, the priest, after filling the church with incense, produces and consecrates a wafer, elevates it before and for adoration by the people, ceremonially prostrates himself, and then swallows the wafer. Next, after ceremonially mixing in the cup water and wine, he consecrates, elevates, and swallows the mixture. Then he ceremonially washes the plate and cup and rinses his fingers and swallows the rinsings in the presence of the people. At the 11:15 service there are no communicants; the 'priest' alone partakes of the 'mass.' " No assurance was given in the Lord Bishop's reply that the evils complained of would be remedied.

Upon this subject we must also note the weighty and forceful words of Dr. Farrar, Archdeacon of Westminster, who in an address in London on May 9th, 1893, said :

"In spite of the Prayer Book, in spite of rubrics, in spite of the homilies, in spite of the great utterances of all our great divines for centuries, the extreme Ritualistic party are now doing their best to Romanize our worship, our doctrine, our clergy, and our whole institutions. I can understand and I respect the intellectual position of a Romanist, but I cannot so easily understand or so easily respect the position of an English minister who, being a minister of the Reformed Church, under the shadow of that Church, and in the pay of that Church, is yet, to all intents and purposes, a Roman. The crisis has come. *We are in the very midst of the crisis now*; and when you consider the extraordinarily rapid development of what we know as Ritualism—I may say when we consider what has taken place within the last ten years, if the evangelical party is timid, if they are supine and spiritless, if they are afraid, either of loss of popularity or of loss of promotion or preferment, or from love of

peace, to take their part openly and strongly in this struggle, they will have none but themselves to thank if, ten years hence, they find themselves members of a Church which has largely alienated the great heart of the English people, and which is to all intents and purposes Romish in everything but name."*

A recent number of the *Gospel Magazine* traces the growth of Romanism in England to a source not expected by many. It says :

"One by one the men who are responsible for the mischief are named. First among them comes an old offender, in the *Essays and Reviews*, the Archbishop of Canterbury. * * * The indictment is that, when Bishop of Exeter, he protected lawless clergy from the law courts. As Bishop of London he consecrated churches full of popery; took part in, or sanctioned by his presence, disloyal practices; treated with contempt the complaints of the distressed churchmen; authorized, in one instance, the use of the 'Manual of the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament,' containing Transubstantiation, Adoration of the Host, Hearing Mass, etc., and permitted requiem masses. He also took part in Holy Communion in St. Paul's with altar lights. Writing to ecclesiastical dignitaries in Russia, he dates it 'as on the day of the Annunciation of the Most Holy Mother of God, ever Virgin.' Writing to the Pope, he claims that his ministers are sacrificing priests, and the Lord's Supper a sacrificial offering, as in Rome. He appointed canons, preachers and chaplains—all Ritualists; besides thirty-four priests to important benefices—all strong Ritualists—their names are given. He permits masses for the dead in ten churches under his jurisdiction. With this indictment by the Church Association, his impeachment ought to follow next."

The Pittsburg *Catholic* comments upon the above with great satisfaction as follows :

"Ritualism is said to be steadily rising, and continues to flow steadily in the same direction. The advanced Anglican movement draws nearer, and all its most prominent elements are

* Read *Hom. Rev.*, Vol. 27, p. 278.

distinctly Roman Catholic. It can only end in wholesale conversions to the ancient Church. The real must take the place in these hearts hungering for the truth. Now we read of an increased devotion to the Holy Mother; her banners carried through their churches; their borders beautifully worked in gold, with the various emblems of our Lady, viz., the lily, the rose, and the Ark of the Covenant. She is addressed as *Maria Mater Gratia, Dulcis Parenis Clementia*, not in English, but in the sweet and noble tongue of the liturgy of the Catholic Church of the West—the inscription giving to our Lady one of the most stupendous of her titles, 'Mother of Grace,' and in words of which the well-known sequel is the direct invocation of her prayers."

How serious to contemplate the awful fact that, this syncretic tendency of the Church, attendant with such sacrilege and ungodliness is not a distinctive peculiarity of the Established Church of England only, but that it is gradually permeating with its dominating subtlety and influence the entire Protestant Church. Alas! for Protestant England, and also for Protestant America, if she shall be thus dominated by that influence and spirit which so unmistakably attend the spurious modern altar development.

Much of the architecture and church furnishings no longer continue to represent and conform to the inner content of the New Testament economy, and the interpretation and spirit of the Scriptures. External tenants are the basis, and a different spirit is at work. The precepts of God's kingdom and his Spirit are no longer in supreme evidence in the matter of adaptation and conformity. The spirit is man-centered, selfish and persistent. With irresistible tenacity it forces its way, with the marked evidences of its growing inner, cankerous corruption, revealed in such manifestations as, a self-appointed hierarchy, the growing importance and arrogance of the clergy, the imposition of new and strange ceremonies, and the ever increasing elaboration and so-called enrichment of the Ritual. It was the combined influence of these forces of error that united with man's selfish perversity to form what are called the modern altar and its accessories. God's house of prayer, built

under such conception, could not be expected to conform to the doctrine and spirit of the holy Scriptures. Spiritual things are spiritually discerned; and it is also true that, if a resultant shall be in conformity with, and represent the spiritual, it must find its source and inception in the spiritual. If the resultant, therefore, or the expression revealed in form as in the altar, etc., is not in harmony with the Word and the Spirit, it is because of a false conception and spirit which led to the result. Therefore, the first step in rectifying these gross errors appearing in the form of church contents and the attending expressions in worship, is a serious consideration of the doctrines and spirit of the Scriptures and the apostolic conception, with a sincere resolve and determination to allow only such forms and expressions in worship as shall conform to the will of God, as revealed through his pure Word and unerring Spirit.

Those churches, therefore, are most fortunate and appropriate in their arrangement which embrace the most accurate, historical and Scriptural conception and significance. With this view uppermost, we must concede the place for the altar to be in front of the pulpit, which is elevated above it; thus giving the Word the pre-eminence and first place in Christian worship, holding that central position which commands the whole church. This is in full accord with the doctrine of the Lutheran Church, and other Evangelical Protestant Churches; and the explicit teaching of Martin Luther himself, who declared the preaching of the Word to be the principle part in worship.

"Therefore," says Luther, "upon whom the office of preaching is bestowed, upon him is bestowed the highest office in Christianity, accordingly he may also baptize, hold mass and exercise the care of souls."* Hence all other services and ceremonies are subordinate and hold a secondary place to preaching. And the same high and noble authority also says: "The daily mass shall by all means be abolished; for the word is more important than the mass. * * * There are other matters which will shape themselves in due time. But the important part of the whole matter is that everything may be done in such a manner that the word may have free course,

* *Erlangen Edition, 22, p. 151.*

and may not again be an empty sound, as has heretofore been the case. It would be better to abandon everything else, rather than the word. There is nothing of more value than the word."* And again the great Reformer informs us that "the spiritual tyrants have despised and disregarded the office of preaching and have sundered it wide from spiritual government." So to-day, the word of God is despised and disregarded by failing to accord it the place of primary importance, and by allowing it to be obscured and overshadowed through the practice of abuses in the Lord's sanctuary.

"Preaching in the services of the Western churches was always subordinate to the liturgy, and the relapse into savagery occasioned by the migrations of the peoples drove it completely out of the field."† Such are the sad results of a sinful neglect of, and substitution for, the preaching of the gospel. This lapse into formality and heathenism would have been impossible under a faithful preaching of the pure Word of God. The importance and place of preaching was again re-established in the seventh century under the missionary zeal and fervor which swept through the Western Church. At the same time these churches were found in a predicament and were compelled to do many of their first works over; for "then very few priests could compose a sermon;" and judging from their religious proclivities and development revealed in their dead formal worship and consequent lapsing into gross idolatry and heathenism, we believe it was less possible for them, even with their renewed missionary spirit, to offer fervent, spontaneous free prayer, having lost this power through the use of dead ritualistic forms and stereotyped expressions of prayer. Such a wholesale lapse into religious indifference and spiritual death would have been impossible under a faithful presentation of the Word in form and content.

Preaching the Word holds primarily a double relation and a two-fold bearing upon the hearer. The intrinsic value of the Word which we call its content, as given in the Scriptures of divine inspiration, is not all. Considerable of its influence and

* Erlangen Edition, 22, pp. 155, 156.

† Kurtz, *Church Hist.*, Vol. I, p. 517.

power is conveyed through the medium of the form of expression. This medium of form is possibly as far-reaching in its variety and scope as are the different precepts and principles and doctrines of the Word. In preaching we have the Word plus the man. Taking into account the personality, manner, talents, etc., of the man, we have form of a far-reaching and varied character. Multiply this by the thousands who preach the gospel, and the variety of form is incomprehensible. We carry the same to church architecture and furniture, etc., and the same law applies. Here the silent influence of form is a power that seems to fall short of a true estimate. Hence the great necessity of a proper location, bearing and relation of the pulpit to the other sacred furnishings of the sanctuary. This argument is strengthened only the more as we tarry to consider the great importance of the preaching of the Word.

It is demanded because "the Scriptures lay the chief stress on the Word, Is. 54:11; Luke 8:5-18; 1 Cor. 1:17, attributing to it under the Holy Spirit each and every part in the movement through which the provisions of redemption become effectual in the salvation of men, from its beginning in illumination, 1 Pet. 1:19; 2 Tim. 3:15; 1 John 5:11, through repentance, Acts 2:37, faith, Rom. 10:17, regeneration, 1 Pet. 1:23; James 1:18, sanctification, John 17:17, and salvation, Rom. 1:16; 2 Tim. 3:15; Acts 10:34-37. It is immediately evident that in the Church's worship, where redemption is to be caused to pass into the personal experience of men, the Word, as the means which is at once the Holy Spirit's instrument in accomplishing each and all the parts of the work and the means *in* all means, should have primacy and ruling place."*

Therefore, knowing the doctrine and spirit of God's Word, the sources of abuses within the Church, and her weak syncretic tendency that made their entrance possible, what shall we say of the countenance given them to-day? We have not only the "leaven of the Pharisees," but we have considerable of the lump of Paganism. We are having forms and accessories, vestments and enrichments galore, regardless of their source,

* *Christian Worship* by Richard and Painter, p. 331.

significance and influence. These dead forms, symbols and accessories are altogether foreign to a pure Christianity. Their influence is the work of death to spirituality and the true power of the Church. It is not a matter of human fancy or personal preference that should decide the choice and use in matters of worship in our holy religion, but that high, spiritual regard for the unmistakable direction in Holy Writ. Every feature in worship should be in strict accord and full harmony with the simple and pure Word of God.

The placing of the altar in the rear of the platform, raised above the level of the pulpit, and made prominent by exposing it fully to view, is an arrangement which necessitates the relegating of the pulpit to some secondary position, as to the side. In such arrangement we have the Jewish and Roman expression of the sacrificial and sacramental idea in worship which we must condemn as unscriptural and consequently out of harmony with true Christian worship.

The altar, therefore, had better be supported by legs or pillars, excluding its pagan development by allowing the lower part to remain open. Thus it will declare by its very construction that the true Church of Christ in Protestantism does not sanction, but forever abhors the heathen practice of relic worship, idolatrous symbolism and sacramentalism. This will also accord with the apostolic conception of both altar and table combined, the terms being used interchangeably.

The true position cannot be held by the radical or Iconoclast who has destroyed the altar and declares there is none; neither can it be held by those who are *ultra* and *hyper* in their *dogmatics* upon the subject; and who are usually known for their legalism, formality, bigotry and ecclesiasticism. Both extremes are erratic and dangerous. The only true and safe position lies in the true conservative conception based upon the unerring direction and spirit of the New Testament Scriptures.

Christianity is a living religion. As such, in her pure life, she bursts asunder her shackles, and steps out from under the shadows of dead forms and symbols of ancient heathenism, and becomes the embodiment of the great eternal principles of truth and righteousness. Hence the necessity of a true conformity of her life in form and practice.

ARTICLE V.

THE CHURCH AND EDUCATION.

BY PROFESSOR J. HOWARD STOUGH, PH.D.

The Church has had many problems set for her to solve. Some of these problems have arisen out of the peculiar environment in which particular churches and bodies have been placed; some of them have arisen from the false conceptions the world entertains of the aims, the claims and the functions of the Church; some of them come from within; and some of them have arisen out of the very nature of the Church itself. Some of these problems have been easy of solution; some of them very difficult; some are only imaginary, but some are tremendously real. One of these real problems with which we have been brought face to face within the last decade, is the problem of Education. This is one of the deepest of human interests, a subject far more vital than politics, and that is well nigh as universal as religion. It is vital to the prosperity and stability of the State, the success of the Church, and the happiness of the home. And the subject I have set before myself to discuss is "The Church and Education," or just this problem of the relation of the Church to the educational work of the country and the age in which we are living. We are assured from many sources that the Church is just at this time facing a very grave crisis, and especially in our own Church that we have reached a place in our work where a choice is to be made, a veritable "parting of the ways," where one path leads to a sure defeat, while the other sweeps up to a glorious success. In view of this state of mind, it is, in my opinion, specially important that the subject be reviewed in all its bearings, dispassionately and impersonally. What I have to say, therefore, is not to be construed as aimed at any person. I recognize the right of others to think for themselves, even though their opinion

conflicts with my own at every vital point, and I claim the same right, and also the right to give utterance to my views without being charged with personality. What I am to discuss is *not men* but *opinions*, and whatever I may say I hope it will be understood in this light. The opinions that I may criticize are not those of any one person ; they are, so to speak, in the air ; many men are saying things that ought not to be allowed to pass without a challenge, lest it be thought that there is no answer that can be made. But there are so many things to be said that I may not tarry long at the threshold with many words of introduction.

One would think that on such a subject a definition would be unnecessary, for Education is no new topic, as you may be aware. But I feel that a clear definition would do something towards clearing up some of the misapprehensions current on this subject by excluding, if in no other way, some of the things that are said and written on it. Now, words mean only what those who use them agree that they shall mean. White and black are terms descriptive of certain qualities and are significant only by mutual agreement in those who use them. If men agreed to use them with their significations reversed, it might be done without any ambiguity resulting therefrom. And the word "education" has a time-honored signification, one that all scholars are practically agreed upon, and to use it in any other sense argues either ignorance of the true meaning or a failure to discriminate properly between right and wrong uses. Let us turn to the dictionary for a definition, not because the dictionary has fixed any definition and is infallible, but because it simply records the various senses in which men have generally agreed to use a word. I quote from the *Century Dictionary*, because it happens to be the most convenient. Any other one would not materially alter the definition.

"Education is the imparting or acquisition of knowledge : mental and moral training : cultivation of the mind, feelings and manners. In a broad sense with reference to man, it comprehends all that disciplines and enlightens the understanding, corrects the temper, cultivates the taste, forms the manners and

habits; in a narrower sense, it is the special course of training pursued, as by parents and teachers, to secure any one or all of these ends." It quotes, further, James Freeman Clarke in "Self-Culture" as follows: "Education in the true sense is not mere instruction in Latin, English, French or history. It is the unfolding of the whole human nature. It is growing up in all things to our highest possibility."

Now you will notice this about it, that it is *exclusive*. It lays stress on the *mental* and *moral* sides of our nature, those factors in our make-up that make us *men* and that differentiate us from the animal kingdom to which we are related by our physical nature. *Only man can be educated*, and education as applied to him has to deal with the informing and developing of his mental and moral powers and capacities. An animal is *trained*, and whether it is a pig which has been trained to pick out the letters of the alphabet, or a horse to do what seems marvelous tricks at a signal from his master, *it is all only training*. And that which has to deal with the imparting or the acquisition of manual dexterity on the part of man, the using of the hands to do things, the making of the muscles to obey the behests of the will, it is all one and the same thing; *it is training pure and simple, not education*. This definition, therefore, excludes much that seeks to be sheltered under the broad aegis of this word "education." It may flatter the vanity of the unlettered man who can pound gravel under a low joint in the track, and do it better than a university graduate, to be told that he is educated just to that extent; or the mechanic who knows nothing but how to fashion and fit a horse-shoe, that he is to that extent educated; or the indolent or incapable boy who chooses to take wood-carving rather than the mathematics and other more difficult studies of the High School, that he is being educated; but the fact remains that what these persons have is training and not education, and to use the word "educate" to describe the process or the result is a clear case of mis-application. Now I do not wish to be understood as in any way depreciating the laboring man or any station or calling, but I do most strenuously object to labeling that as education, which is not. I plead for

common and simple honesty in the use of language. The laboring man may be a worthy and particularly useful member of society, but educated he is not, unless there has been a training of the mental and moral faculties.

This definition not only excludes some things that ought to be shut out, but it is also inclusive. It makes the process applicative to the whole man. Man is not simply a thinking machine; he also loves and hates; he reaches up his hands and lays hold on God and sees in the face of Jesus Christ his own manhood glorified. He is made but little lower than the angels and all the possibilities that lie locked up in his marvelous constitution are to be called out and to be developed to their limit. *Culture and manhood* are the ends aimed at in every rational theory of education. Any programme that falls short of this in any particular, that does not strive to make man what God designed him to be, is in so far faulty and imperfect. But you say that all this is commonplace. Even so. The commonplace is sometimes *true* and needs to be insisted upon as against theories that are novel and plausible, but which may for all that be unsound.

In this work certainly no organized body is more deeply interested than the Church. The State is the other great agency in this work. It is concerned that men be intelligent, that they be moral to the extent of obedience to law; but it cannot go beneath the surface and deal with the heart and take cognizance of the motives that mould and influence character. If the outside be clean, the inside may be as it will; if the outside is not clean up to the standard set by the law, the State lays its punitive hand on the individual, but it has no agency and knows of no means for reformation. It is concerned with conduct, while the Church concerns itself first and chiefly with character. But now a strange thing has come to pass. These two great agencies stand face to face, not shoulder to shoulder, in this great work of developing the coming generations into the truest and loftiest manhood and womanhood. They are represented as rivals in the market bidding against each other in fierce competition for the privilege of making our boys and

girls worthy citizens and inspiring them with noble ideals of life. If this be the true state of affairs it is exceedingly unfortunate. There *ought* to be harmony and the closest co-operation between all the forces in this great work. But if this is too much to expect we must face the situation as we find it. What is to be done about it? We are calmly told by a man, who, while not now connected with a state institution, has yet spent most of his professional life in such an institution and so may fairly be supposed to represent the views current there, that the Church must abandon the ideals she has entertained and for which she has so earnestly striven for years, that she must change her programme in such a way and to such an extent that there will no longer be any reason for her continuance in this work of education and so be forced by the stern logic of events to turn her work over to the State, or be forced to shut her doors from a lack of patronage. I do not mean to say that he has said all this in so many words, but that this is the logic of his paper. An echo of this has found its way into one of our own church papers. Such a proposition is both radical and novel. But men sometimes draw large conclusions from small premises, and it is well that we should consider it carefully, for it would be folly to retreat from a position long held unless it is shown to be untenable. And in a matter so vital as this it is wisdom to make haste slowly.

This new programme proposes to set aside the traditional courses that have had the sanction of time and have been tried and found useful in the past centuries of educational history, that have consisted of the languages, mathematics, literature, a reasonable amount of science, and philosophy, and to substitute for these other branches, which are, in the judgment of their promoters, more practical; to shorten the period spent in the acquisition of an education by several years, so that students can be sent out to the work of life earlier; and also to offer a wider choice earlier in the course so that students may select such studies as will suit their individual tastes or proposed work in life. The word "*utility*" is written large over the whole programme. Whatever does not fit this Procrustean bed is to be

hewn or stretched to suit its dimensions. For this new education it is claimed that the age is crying ; it is this that is filling the halls of the state institutions and emptying our church colleges, and that unless we accede to it within a decade it will bring our existence and work to an end.

Before we turn to the merits of the proposition itself, let us glance for a moment at the basis, the reason for this proposed revolution in our educational ideas and plans.

It is claimed that the students are flocking to the state institutions because they are furnishing the education that the people wish and that the church schools are losing because they do not. Let us look at the facts. Taking the State of Kansas as a fair sample, and no exception can be taken to this, inasmuch as it has been chosen to illustrate the point at issue by others, we find that the State has by no means a monopoly in the work of education. The latest report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction contains the following summary of the school work of the State :—

Denominational colleges and academies	56
Number of teachers and professors	685
Number of students	8010
Value of libraries	\$326,875
Value of property	\$2,768,100

Over against this set the figures for the state institutions, of which there are five :—

Number of instructors in the five institutions	193
Number of students	4733
Value of libraries and apparatus	\$292,000
Value of buildings and grounds	\$2,684,959

It may be said that these figures do not include the High Schools which are a part of the state system and which do work that is in part correlated with some done in the colleges and academies ; and granting this, and swelling the numbers to an equality with the denominational schools, it after all makes no great showing. It will mean at the best, that the churches are

doing as much toward the proper education of our people by their free gifts as the State is doing backed by the large sums raised from taxation and the thorough organization of the whole public school system leading up to the schools for higher education. That the State with all the machinery in her hands is doing *barely one-half* of the work certainly does not indicate that the new programme has such wide-spread endorsement, or that it is so eagerly sought after as we have been told. And this fact becomes the more apparent when we come to analyze the student roll of the State University. The catalogue of 1902-3 registers 1294 students in all the departments. Of this number we find that 639, or *nearly one-half*, are in what is called the "School of Arts," pursuing a course substantially the same as is offered in all the leading denominational colleges of the State. Of the other half, 212 are in strictly professional schools of law, medicine and pharmacy; 63 are post-graduates, 112 are in the fine arts, while 242, or *about one-fifth* of the whole number, are pursuing courses in the School of Engineering. So that even there the students are not showing any marked preference for the newer, up-to-date courses. Another fact in evidence is gained when you take a glance at the list of instructors and find the ratio is about 6 : 1, or that there are about six teachers for the old-fashioned college course to one for the new and improved course that teaches men to do things.

But granting simply for the sake of argument that the state institutions are flourishing, that increasing numbers are flocking to their doors, and that the denominational schools are losing and languishing, the conclusion sought to be derived from this supposed state of affairs may or may not be true. It remains to be seen whether the State is furnishing what the people want, while the Church is offering stale and shelf-worn goods. There may be other causes at work sufficient to produce the result. If the conclusion be valid, we should see a decrease all around; our neighbors also should feel the pressure; a wail would come from other States. But the facts are, that other colleges are reporting large gains in their numbers. In our own Church, Carthage, Wittenberg and Gettysburg, all have

larger numbers than at any other time in their history; so that if in our own school we have fallen below the average we must not rashly draw conclusions, but the local conditions should be studied and in them we may find ample reasons. It is both unfair and unwise to argue from narrow premises to wide and general conclusions. It is to be remembered that the constituency of our college is widely scattered, comprising three States, that it is not large in number at the best; that we have in our county one of the best equipped county high schools in the State, which operates to cut off a large element that would naturally come to us. Most of the other schools are beset by few or none of these difficulties. The other denominations around us are very much stronger than we, both in numbers and in wealth, and their churches are nearer their colleges. There are more Methodists in the eastern half of Kansas twice over than we have of Lutherans in the three States of Kansas, Nebraska and Missouri who in any sense can be called tributary to Midland College. To reach our college many of our students must travel long distances and sometimes right past the doors of other colleges much nearer home. Then you must remember that the State University as the apex of the state system of schools has a tremendous advantage in the fact that every high school in the State is affiliated with it and that the majority of the teachers are either graduates of that institution or have been students there, and their influence in more than one instance has been powerful enough to send students there who would otherwise come to the church school. It has also large numbers and is an illustration of the Scripture that "to him that hath it shall be given and he shall have the more abundance." Students are apt to follow the crowd. And so if it were true that the state institutions are doing the large part of the work of education, as it is not, the reason would have to be sought in something else than in the sort of courses offered and the kind of work done. For a careful comparison will show that outside of the professional lines they offer practically the same work that we are doing in the denominational schools, with this difference possibly, that we are doing it *a lit-*

tle better than the State. If any are skeptical about this they have only to recall that only once within the memory of students has the State University taken first place at an oratorical contest, *with a student of her own training*. The denominational schools have somehow taken the prizes with startling regularity. That we are doing better work than these state institutions in some directions I do know, and I more than half suspect that this fact accounts for the unfair discrimination made against the church schools by state officials in the matter of teachers' certificates.

But some one may say: "If the State is doing practically the same work that the Church is doing, why duplicate our plants? Why not retreat from this field and leave the State in possession?" And that seems a fair proposition on the face of it. *But for the sake of variety let us put it another way.* Why should not the State retreat and leave the field to the Church? The proposition is as broad as it is long; nay, its dimensions are in favor of the Church, for the Church was in the field of education long in advance of the State, and in large sections of our country it is still the main agent, and for the largest part of the past century it was so far superior in its equipment that there was scarcely a state institution that would compare with those of the Church, and even now it is doing by far the larger part of this important work throughout the country. A tolerably thorough examination of the educational tables in the New York *World's Almanac* for the current year reveals the fact that there are in this country no less than 246 denominational colleges with a student roll of fully 100,000 as against 32 state universities with a roll of 42,000. Besides these there are a large number that are classed as un-denominational that are yet supported by the gifts of Christian people, and while not under the direct control of any denomination, are not state institutions, and which should therefore be added to the list of those who are doing work in lines correlated with that of the Church. The State University men are constantly saying to us: "You should leave the work of education to us; we have the students and the money, and the buildings and the

equipment." Why should not we retort: "You should leave this field to the Church. We have more schools, we have more teachers, we have more students, we have more money invested in our plants, and we are doing the work as well as you have been doing it"? But laying aside these facts, why should not the Church cease to spend money in doing what the State is doing and for which we all pay in paying our taxes? It is a fair question. Let me answer with a short page out of history.

The State University of Kansas was founded in 1864, twenty-three years before the establishment of Midland College. Why, now, did the Church feel that it was necessary for her to engage in this work in this State? The answer is not far to seek. For the twenty-three previous to the founding of the college and during the years since, the State University has not given the Lutheran Church of the General Synod, so far as I have been able to learn, and I have taken some pains to make inquiries, *a solitary man for her ministry. Nearly forty years of educational work and not a man for our ministry!* And the same thing is true, I believe, of the State University of our neighboring State of Nebraska. This state of affairs was not because there were no Lutherans in attendance on these institutions, for professors have boasted to me that they have more Lutherans in attendance at their several universities than we had at our college. This boast I do not believe to be in accord with the facts. This year, according to an official list from the office of the Chancellor, there are just 19 at the State University of Kansas who are either members of the Lutheran Church or have indicated a preference for our Church, and a cursory examination of that list shows that a large proportion of them are of Swedish extraction and so are not really tributary to our college. Nor is the case exceptional as regards our Church. An examination of the Alumni roll shows that the results to the Church in general are very little better. From 1873-1900 the Kansas State University has graduated over 700 from the university proper, with the bachelors' degree, and of that number that institution has sent out just five ministers, one mission-

ary, and four theological students. What is the reason? That is not my business to decide. It is the business of those who think that the education by the State gives all that we want to make reply.

Over against this let me put the record of the years since 1887 for our college. Of the 52 male graduates, 19 have entered the work of the Christian ministry and two are serving as missionaries in undenominational work in a foreign land. To these let us add 20 who have been brought into the ministry through the instrumentality of the college and have pursued their theological studies in the Western Theological Seminary, which has grown out of and been made necessary by the work of the college; and there is to be added also the students now in the seminary and college who are in preparation for that work. Could not the State do all for you that you are doing? Could it not furnish the Church with ministers? Do you assert that the State University is opposed to religion in such a way as to turn men away from the Gospel ministry? I have nothing to say on any of these points, and simply re-affirm that the State has had nearly forty years to show what it could do for us and in that time has done absolutely nothing for our Church. And I repeat that it is for others to find a reason for these things; not because I know of no reason, for I think that a satisfactory reason is not hard to find, but because it is the business of those who defend the state system to account for these facts. But such being the case, it became a vital matter for the Church to educate her own men for the field on the field. We are face to face with a crisis in the work of our Church in the fact that we do not have the men to fill the vacancies that are constantly occurring; that with all that the seminary can do in the preparation of men, it is not able to send out enough men to make good the depletions that come from natural causes. Suppose now that there were to be withdrawn all these young men who have so largely manned our pastorates and that have come through direct influence of the college on the Church, and what would be the result? Just as the situation in 1887 was such as to demand the establishment of a college as vital to the success of

our work or even the continuance of it, so even now it is a vital matter to support that which has been the main agent in the development of the work of the Church and must come to be depended upon more and more if it is to continue to grow.

In this question of turning the work of education over to the State it is well to look at it in the light of experience and ask what has been the result where the State has had the field to herself. I quote from a paper by President Bashford of Ohio Wesleyan University at Delaware, Ohio:

"Michigan is usually cited as the best example of a state system of higher education in the country. The founding of the University of Michigan in 1840, only three years after the organization of the State, her early and continuous devotion to the work of a college of liberal arts, the State's appropriations of more than ten millions of dollars to the University since 1870 and the present grant of some \$600,000 a year have enabled the University of Michigan to absorb, to a large extent, the college work of the State. As a consequence, only five private colleges exist in that State, and these in a crippled condition. As a result, despite the large appropriations from the State, and the largest state university in the country, Michigan has one student in college to 423 of her population, while Ohio has one student in college to 297 of her population. In other words, Michigan must increase her already large expenditures, and—what is much more difficult—increase the attendance at her university and private colleges 30 per cent. in order to reach the position now occupied by Ohio in the field of higher education. Minnesota, with a state university enrolling 3550 students, has less than half as many college graduates in proportion to her population as has Connecticut without any State University." Or, where the state university becomes so large that it absorbs the work of education there is a large falling off in the number of those who are able to avail themselves of the privilege of an education beyond that which is afforded by the public schools. The small college, which is usually a church institution, carries the benefits of education to the largest number by distributing the sources over a larger territory, and by

its very presence inspiring many who would otherwise never have dreamed of it or have felt that it was possible.

The really vital thing, the thing that is alarming, is not that the trend of students is towards the state institutions, for the fact is the other way, but that *the vast multitude are going to no school*. They can now scarcely retain the boys in the High School till they reach the end of that course, and of those who do, only a small proportion continue their education at any higher school. The state university, no less than the denominational school, feels this state of affairs. And the reason for this lies in the intense eagerness of the young to get out into the world and begin a career of money-making. The wave of commercialism, that is sweeping like a great flood over our country and that is apparently carrying everything before it, is responsible for these impulses. The stories of the fabulous fortunes that have been made by combinations and the formation of trusts, the sudden rise of men from the wage-earning to the millionaire class, has been a gilded bait thrown out to the young of this generation, and they would be almost more than human did they not seek to profit by the apparent opportunities of the present. They are all eager to be in the path of this golden shower lest it may not last, and they come too late to get their share. They have no knowledge of what life means; too often they do not care. They are willing to bow down and worship the god of this world even though they lose their immortal spirits in so doing. Now I am not "preaching" but simply stating a sober fact, and there is not a man here of any experience but can substantiate all this and add large items to it. It is a curse; it is a fever in the veins; it is a paralysis in the brain; it is an atrophy of the heart. It is entering into the highest apartments of our humanity and filling them with human greed; it is debasing man from his exalted position as little lower than the angels and is making him but little higher than the animal. *What shall we do? Shall we surrender to it* and furnish it food to grow strong, or shall we seek by all the means in our power to curb it, to put restraints upon it so that it shall do as little harm as possible? *It cannot last.* The

shrewd business men, the very men whose wonderful achievements have done so much to fire the hearts of the youth of the land, are warning us that a reaction must come. Common sense would tell us that, if there were no far-sighted men to give us warning. What are we to do? Shall we surrender to the cry for other courses, for short cuts to knowledge? Shall we belie all our past, all the experience of the ages, and yield to a demand that carries with it its own refutation? Surely not. What is education for if be not to make the educated man a leader of his fellows? He has a responsibility to them which he cannot shun or escape by following the crowd blindly whithersoever its whim at the moment leads. His duty is to stand as a wall against that which he sees will work incalculable harm, and even if the public cries for these things, he is not to sell his birthright for a questionable mess of pottage. And what is the mission of the Church if it be not to show men a better way? Because the world is at enmity with God and does not crave the benefits of salvation, shall we relax our efforts to bring them to a sense of sin and the need of a Saviour? Does the question of *numbers* or of *dollars* enter into our consideration there? Why then is this, which is one of the most important fields in which the energies of the Church seeks outlet? The old motto, "the voice of the people is the voice of God," is no part of my theology, and no part of the teaching or the practice of the Church. But this is not a mere matter of sentiment. If it were, there might be some excuse if we should abandon it when it seems to go counter to the current of thought or feeling of the times. There are sound reasons for it. And to disregard them for the sake of popularity is a course that is to be condemned by all alike. Let me briefly enumerate some of these reasons.

First. The demand to change the course of study that has been for years the traditional course, rests in part on a fallacy. It presupposes that all subjects are of equal educational value, or that they are mutually and indifferently interchangeable as are the parts of some machines, a notion that has been discussed by all the generations of teachers since the days of

Socrates, and has almost without exception been rejected. It contains its own refutation ; for if it be true that all are of equal value, and that the "smallest part of an education is the knowledge imparted," then the question may rightly be asked : "Why change at all ?" There is then no sound reason for disturbing the courses of study that have been sufficient during the whole history of education in this country, to give us the long list of able and scholarly men who have moulded this nation in all its essential features and have made us what we are. If all knowledge is of equal value educationally, *then Greek is as good as science, and literature is as good as engineering*, and if the student carries nothing that is of special value from any of them into his after life, they might as well stand just as they are and the student study Greek as well as anything else. And all the more as we do know that the study of that language *has* educational value, while the other subjects are yet in the experimental stage.

Now I am by no means prepared to decry manual training. I would belie all my tastes and instincts if I did, for I have a pair of hands that have always had the knack of using tools, and no man delights more in this gift, for gift it is. But there has never been any special need to encourage it ; the need has always been for repression. It has furnished one of the outlets for the play-impulse that is in every soul. It has been one of my choicest means of recreation, especially since the years have come when more vigorous sports have come to be too much like work. And in their proper place I would be glad to see as many of the manual operations taught as could be provided for ; but not as an education or as a part of any educational system. It is *play*, and as such it may well be employed, but to supplant with it those real studies that require real work, to make this play a part of what is soberly regarded as a preparation for life is to make all educational pretensions farcical. It would be just as reasonable to give credit for the play on the foot-ball field or on the base-ball nine or with the tennis racket as to credit play-work that is done with the hammer and saw. Let the boys play with tools all they will, let the girls sew and embroider and cook to their hearts content,

but let us not teach them that education is mere play. An education should be synonomous with work, and juggle with it as you may, it can never be made anything else.

Secondly. The plea for shorter courses in the college comes from two sources. It comes first from the teachers in some of the professional schools; but here it is inconsistent, for these schools in many instances are lengthening their own courses and at the same time raising the standards of admission. They call for more time to do "their work and at the same time for better prepared men to do it, and some of the medical schools have gone so far that a college diploma will soon be one of the requirements for admission. When now they insist that we shall take less time and prepare their men better, they are asking the impossible. In addition to this it is coming more and more to be realized that the man who is to "get on" in any one of the learned professions, (and that is not now limited to the three traditional professions) must have a trained mind. Whether that training is acquired in wrestling with the Latin subjunctive or the Greek verb or the propositions of Euclid or the more abstruse formulæ of Calculus or what not, *it must be had.* Mental and moral fabric is the need of the coming years. And even in the ranks of business it does not need the authority and weight of Seth Low's name to assure us that "*the trained mind can master the problems of business better than the untrained mind, and it can master other problems better for which it has any natural capacity.*"

Specialization is to be the programme of the coming century. The field of knowledge has grown so wide that no man can hope to become one of the encyclopedia scholars such as the past has had. Men must content themselves with some one corner of the field. In Germany we best see this doctrine of specialization worked out to its logical results, and I will be frank enough to say that I do not covet for our country or our scholars the pre-eminence she has won in this respect. I yield to no man in my reverence for her profound scholars, men who have gone to the very bottom of the part of human knowledge they have appropriated as their field; but I remember that the

profound scholar in one branch too often is a mere child in everything else. Germany is the land of scholars, but she is also the land of doctrinaires, the land of scepticism, the land of socialism and in fact of almost every "ism" that the mind of man has conceived. Her scholars are deep but they lack breadth. For the practical purposes there is needed a correlation of our knowledge, an understanding of the mutual relations of the various branches of knowledge, which demands a breadth of culture. For the work that lies before this and the coming generation there must be a broad and deep foundation, *and the place to broaden out is at the bottom and not at the top.* Bishop Spalding says: "The ideal that is presented is that of a complete and harmonious culture, the aim of which is not to make an artisan, a physician, a merchant, a lawyer, but a man alive in all his faculties; touching the world at all points; for whom all knowledge is desirable and all beauty is lovable, and for whom fine bearing and noble action are indispensable." "With such an education," says another authority, "as a basis, the young man may become a specialist not with a warped mind, but with one capable of receiving aid in his own particular science from all studies."

The present is not like the past. Think what tremendous strides forward have been made in the past twenty-five years! What the next decade will bring forth, who can imagine? We know one thing, and that is that the law of the "survival of the fittest" will have many a clear illustration; that only the men who are competent by the breadth of their culture and the trained powers of their minds and the strength of their character will survive the tests. Among our railroads, some systems have been to the enormous expense of rebuilding their entire road-bed, replacing their bridges with larger and heavier structures, simply because the old bed and the bridges that were ample for the equipment and the business of the past are utterly inadequate to the demands of the present. Heavier rails must be laid to sustain the tremendous pounding of the enormous engines of today, and the foundations must be strengthened, or disaster and ruin would be the result. Need I apply this to

life? The demands are growing greater every year, and that man is courting failure complete and sure who thinks that he can do the work of the present or the coming times with a more slender equipment than the past has required, or that strong and deep foundations are not needed for the increased and heavier traffic of life. Our architects are building great buildings; up and up the stories climb into the air till city streets are like the dark canons in some mountain district, but these men are not so foolish as to think that the higher they go the shallower the foundations should be. On the contrary, there is a distinct ratio between the depth below the ground and the height above. A cottage may have a shallow foundation, but a "sky-scraper" dare not. Wherever a man serves during the years to come, he must be thoroughly grounded. Nowhere is this more imperative than in the men who are to serve the Church at her altars. It is simply sublimated nonsense to think or to say that anything short of the most thorough preparation for the special training of the theological seminary will answer for the coming age. The four years of the college course are barely sufficient. And the men who advocate this shortening of the preparatory period are the very men who would first ridicule and then rebel against the ministration of any but a finished man in the pulpit. Theologians trying to talk science about which they know but little, and scientists trying to discuss theology about which they know even less, have been the causes of much of the needless wrangling between Science and Religion.

The other demand comes from parents and children, or rather, to put it more correctly, from children who rule and parents who are ruled. Most of them are only too ready to follow the line of the least resistance and follow their wishes rather than their wants. They come almost with a bill of rights in their hands and demand that we yield to their superior intelligence, and parents too often weakly yield. Sometimes they even desire that which will be their child's hurt, but through ignorance. Everybody believes in education, but few people have had the courage to study the subject, unless it has been in the way of

professional work. But they have the courage, not of their convictions, but of their ignorance. A father came one day to our school to arrange for his son and announced that he wished him to omit algebra and geometry, but that he should take all the higher mathematics and pursue the regular classical course. And that man was a Doctor of Divinity in a sister denomination and a preacher of some reputation, but he was a child in education. The average Freshman is not a paragon of wisdom, as I have discovered in a somewhat extended acquaintance with the genus. And scarcely one is ready at that stage of his experience to decide the momentous question of his calling in life. They do not know themselves. Their judgment is unformed. They have no true measure of life. Shall we allow them to take the reins in their own hands and blindly make mistakes that may wreck their life, or shall we try to direct them by the light of a larger experience? We may not plead that this is their own matter and that it is our business to furnish them what they ask for. That is an indifferentism that, tolerated elsewhere, certainly unfits any one to be a teacher of the young. It is our business to see that they make right choices, and to use all our influence in the line of their greatest good. It is not a commercial transaction, the selling of the kind of goods that the people call for. It stands higher than that, or it has no place in the work of the Church. If that is the sum and substance of our relation to this work, then the sooner we turn it over wholly to the State and others, the better.

And I can in no way better close this discussion than with some sound and strong words from Dr. Gunsaulus, President of Armour Institute of Technology. He says: "If you want to find how vast, how powerful is the wave of commercialism which is rolling over us and dashing mercilessly against us, you must stand in an institute of technology, where you are preparing men to do what is often called the successful thing in life. And if you stand there long enough you will behold the angry surf of this selfish movement seething in such a manner as will make you say, when you see the ideal of education in the four years' course assaulted: 'By all the powers that have

entered into American education and American citizenship, these waves can go thus far and no farther.' * * * There is no objection whatever to the success of the commercial spirit in so far as it is in harmony with successful manhood * * * The question for the educator to ask today is not, at what age men should go into life, not how much of youth we can spare to this monster, not at what period this or that can be done; but the question for us to ask is, after this new programme is adopted, what kind of men are we going to have left on our hands? What sort of heart-tissue? What kind of soul-fiber? What hand and head has this man out of which we are to make a noble specimen of the race? * * * The kind of men out of which the American future is to be made is the sort of man who will not object to take time enough to put his youth where God means youth shall be of most service—where it can be educated, where it can be trained, where it can be inspired, in order that with seasoned youth, with intense youth, with law-abiding youth, he can rest his career upon manhood wherever he goes in the world * * * God save us from strenuousness in education! Hustling has got to be a virulent disease. Twenty-five years hence when we get our poise we are going to ask some awful questions with regard to the ferocity with which we are seeking students in some of our schools and the criminal facility with which we are pushing them out into life."

A reckoning time will come, and when it does come, what will be the answer the Church will be prepared to render to these prime questions that affect human lives and her own destiny? Will we have to say with shame and confusion as the old heathen poet wrote:

"Video meliora proboque,
Deteriora sequor,"

or shall we be able to say: "I saw the better things and stood for them without regard to the favor of men?"

ARTICLE VI.

CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

I.

ENGLISH AND AMERICAN

BY REV. M. COOVER, A.M.

Among the editorial notes in *The Expository Times* for December reference is made to the finding of lamps and bowls under the foundations of houses built in Gezer during the period of Israelitish occupation. Mr. Macalister, the excavator at this site, offers an explanation. The Israelites were not free from the customs of other Semitic peoples, and in the founding of their buildings according to primitive customs, placed a living child beneath the walls or door jambs and thus laid the foundations in blood for the sanctification of the dwelling. We recognize the propriety of religious consecration when the corner stone is laid in the erection of a church, but forget our religion when we found our homes and leave them unconsecrated. In ancient Israel a human sacrifice sanctified the house.

This is the first step in the order of the custom. The second step was taken when the child was slain and its body placed in a jar underneath the foundations. The third step is indicated by a jar containing food for the victim placed by the jar containing the human sacrifice. The fourth step inaugurated a bloodless sacrifice with a symbolic substitute. Grape juice symbolizing blood was put into a bowl, and by its side a lamp symbolizing fire, were placed under the walls, or jambs. Lastly the mere symbols of sacrifice sufficed; lamp and bowl constituted the rite of consecration.

The late Dr. Trumbull in his book *The Threshold Covenant* brings to notice this ancient custom of human sacrifice at the laying of foundations, and interprets Joshua 6:26 and 1 Kings 16:34 in reference to it. After the fall of Jericho Joshua

makes the following declaration: "Cursed be the man before the Lord that riseth up and buildeth this city Jericho: with the loss of his firstborn shall he lay the foundation thereof, and with the loss of his youngest son shall he set up the gates thereof." And the record of the fulfilment says: "In his days did Hiel, the Bethelite, build Jericho: he laid the foundation thereof with the loss of Abiram his firstborn, and set up the gate thereof with the loss of his youngest son Segub, according to the word of the Lord which he spake by the hand of Joshua, the son of Nun."

Tylor in his *Primitive Culture* gives numerous examples of this custom among various peoples throughout Europe and Asia as well as America in both ancient and modern times. The custom was in vogue in Alaska till purchased from Russia by the United States, when the human sacrifice was abolished, and an animal or fowl substituted whose blood was deemed of sufficient efficacy. A Thuringian legend declares that the castle wall of Liebenstein was made fast and impregnable by a living child walled in. When the Bridge Gate of the Bremen city walls was demolished a few years ago the skeleton of a child was found incased in the foundations. In Russia and Greece at the present time animal sacrifices are made at the laying of foundations. When the Turkish building at the Columbian Exposition was erected sheep were sacrificed when the foundation was laid. It is said that the Bulgarians in building a house take a string and quickly measure the shadow of some casual passer-by and bury the string under the foundation, expecting the man whose shadow has been measured himself soon to become a shade and thus a sacrifice to consecrate the building.

The human mind cannot rest while an unreconciled dualism exists between God and his created universe. The mind wholly involved in the study of matter will grow materialistic in its conceptions of science; the mind wholly absorbed in the pursuit of theology is wont too freely to spiritualize material forces and forget natural continuity and processes of organic action; but the open mind awake to questions of material science as

well as to the value of a spiritual religion ever seeks to bring into harmony the statements of biblical revelation and the teaching of evolution. Where does evolution begin, and what is its relation to the Creator? Does evolution necessarily exclude the supernatural? If the world admits the supernatural factor in its development, at what point does natural development fail, and where must the supernatural come in?

In *The Bibliotheca Sacra* for October Dr. Charles B. Warring discusses miracle, law, and evolution. Miracles are not intrinsically more wonderful than those things which we regard as the effects of law, says Dr. Warring. It requires no more power to start a watch after it has stopped than to make one. No more power is displayed in raising a dead man to life than in the creation and growth of an individual.

The significance of a miracle does not lie in power displayed nor in the wondrousness of the result. It lies in the uniqueness of the event. If miracles of restoration to life occurred every time a dead man were spoken to, the result would become common and would be deemed natural. The significance of the miracle lies in its singularity. If there were continuity in miraculous events the unusual would be the customary and natural. Let the miracle be represented by a point, and law by a line; successive points make a line; continuity of miracles would form a law. But Dr. Warring proves nothing by this mode of presentation, for miracles lack continuity and form no line and become no law. The case is simply supposititious. The significance of the miracle is in its uniqueness still unexplained. No more power, it is true, may be displayed in the conduct of a miracle than in the conduct of nature in its continuity of action as daily observed in ordinary experience. But it is not the power that is in question, but the mode of the power. There is power enough in nature to revolutionize and overturn all natural law; but why should its continuity of natural action be maintained so as to become a natural law? The supernatural has never become natural law.

In the relation of miracle to evolution Dr. Warring advances the following modal principle. May not the mode of Christ's miracle-working be analogous to the mode of God's action in

creation and development of organic forms? How did Christ proceed to work miracles? He let nature do all it was able to effect and then supplemented the limitation and effected the unusual. Do they need wine? The servants perform their part; the jars are filled to the brim with water; and the contents are served to the wedding party. Do they need food? The five barley cakes and two little fish are taken and blessed, broken and borne to the hungry company. Is Lazarus dead? Attendants roll away the stone; and the man called to life again is not lifted out, but walks forth. The method of miracle-working was to have nature do her all and her best, after which Jesus added what was requisite to complete the transaction. God does likewise in evolving species of living organisms. Each species does its part and reaches its limit; then the divine actor introduces a supplemental factor into the embryo and transforms or modifies the embryonic incipient and produces another species. Species were not born *de novo*, but of preceding species under supernatural modification. The *per saltum* method of development is accepted to account for the frequent gaps all along the line of animal and plant evolution. Plant and animal undergo modifications and partial metamorphoses from effects of environment and interrelation to a certain limit; then nature fails and creation steps in and supplements the action by miraculous causes.

This may be true as Dr. Warring thinks, but scarcely can it be proved or hardly deduced inferentially by analogies from Christ's mode of miracle-working. Wine and bread and resurrected dead, were factors in some of Christ's miracles, but nature did nothing to multiply or restore. The jar and the water were brought into conjunction by human agents; the barley cakes and fish were brought by a boy and blessed by a will factor. Men rolled away the stone from the door of the tomb. Mere natural law had nothing to do with these miracles save to offer the dead constituents. Personalities served as intermediaries between the thing and its transformer, and put matter under command. In respect of material used it was indeed something from something, and kind from congruous kind, but

not in relation of having done its best for a certain end, and then standing in waiting incipiency to be supplemented by the supernatural. There was no development of matter to a certain point to be in readiness after its limitation was reached to meet the supernatural factor.

Dr. Warring deems man's psychological and spiritual powers a supernatural introduction into the embryo of some preceding animal organism ; and why as a disciple of evolution should he derive woman from man by fission after the analogy of lowest organic forms, a mode of origin which does not appear in highly developed life, rather than by an embryonic modification believed by him in the origin of man?

Origin by fission would be a retrogressive modality in an evolution which had reached the stage of man, a mode of miracle quite antiquated in the theory of evolutionary development believed in by Dr. Warring, since he bases his thesis on the law of advancing forms in physical structures. Evolution as a science has its place, and as far as found true must have its recognized relation to the Christian teaching of creation and providence. But evolution of organisms *per saltum frequenter* or *rariter*, is not yet agreed upon nor decided by teachers of eminence in this school of science. We are not yet called upon to reconcile definitively and finally our science and our theology. The hypotheses of scientific cosmogony and organic development will doubtless be different a quarter of a century hence ; meanwhile the first chapter of Genesis can wait. True religion and absolute science come from one God whose mind and work will be found harmonious in the end. But the human mind cannot rest ; it must speak ; and to speak at all it must give its expression to the world before the end is reached, an end, an absolute unity of thought in all realms, which will not be reached in our world-age. So we welcome tentative adjustments which look forward to a reconciliation of dual theories of creation and development.

"The question of evolution cannot be fairly called a Scriptural question ; though its outcome must have serious influence on our interpretations," says Professor Macloskie, of Princeton

University, in discussing *The Outlook of Science and Faith* in *The Princeton Theological Review* for October. Dr. Macloskie takes a most sane view of the situation in reviewing the status past and present of science and faith. He says that evolution has doubtless occurred in initiating the human race, and if proof to this effect be obtained it will not seriously jeopardize Adamic theology. Hypotheses of the mode need not trouble us, nor even such teaching as may entirely rule out the supernatural factor or singular feature of natural action. "No representations of this character are more than tentative until positive proof is forthcoming." "When challenged to prove whether the doctrine of man's evolution is compatible with the record in Genesis, we would decline the effort for two reasons: (1) Because we do not know whether it is or is not compatible. We can see no difficulty in the way, but it is impossible to foresee what discoveries may yet be made, and what unforeseen difficulties may appear. (2) The pressing question is not one of compatibility with the Book of Genesis, but the scientific question whether man's evolution is true or false; and this cannot be determined by the abstract discussions of non-scientists,"

Prof. Curtis, of Yale Divinity School, in an address delivered at the fall opening of that institution and published in *The Biblical World* for December, gives for the pulpit, the Sunday school and the home, the present critical aspect of the value of the Old Testament in religious education. Prof. Curtis distinguishes between religious instruction and religious education; the former aims at giving accurate information; the latter implies more than exact knowledge, it seeks to influence the will and to fashion character. The history of the events recorded in the Old Testament must be distinguished from its religious value. Religion and history must not be mixed. The religion must influence the will and mold the character. The history may not be literal history; it may be parable or allegory; but its religious content is the paramount thing, and not the absoluteness of historic accuracy. God was very near to the people of Israel in their experience. God was the only and first cause; they knew nothing of second causes. God

acted immediately; his hand was close behind every event and providential occurrence. The people were children in intellectual conceptions and habits of thought. We may study our astronomy, mine the earth, sail over seas, and admire the roseate morn, and never think of God. Not so the Hebrew.

"If I ascend up into heaven thou art there :
If I make my bed in sheol, behold thou art there.
If I take the wings of the morning,
And dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea ;
Even there shall thy hand lead me,
And thy right hand shall hold me."

Vivid impressions for moral ends require God near at hand. "The story of Elijah fed by the ravens, and of the unsailing barrel of meal and cruse of oil, impresses a child far more with the thought of divine care than the prosaic narrative of Obadiah sustaining the one hundred prophets with bread and water in two caves. From the latter the child would infer that Obadiah was a good man, but little of the protecting care of our heavenly Father. But this truth having been lodged in the soul cannot be displaced, even if we are later taught that the story of the ravens, and the meal and the oil, may be a parable." Doubt may be cast on the reality of some of the Old Testament characters; Joseph may in some respects be but ideal and not real; but the value of the lesson which his character teaches is the same. Criticism may show the legendary character of the personage, but cannot destroy the moral feeling that we ought not to yield to temptation; that one should go to jail rather than do wrong; that God somehow and some time vindicates the righteous and punishes the wicked.

Chronicles of national corruption and personal vice, of crime and cruelty, of lawlessness and lust, convey lessons of moral right and wrong, stir the conscience and move the moral will today in national and personal life. The poetry of the Bible breathes the longings of the human soul in every age, and gives utterance to the cry wrung from our common experience. The wisdom of the sages gives guiding thought to men today. Penitence, confession, and supplication are germane to every

soul at all times. Our religious education demands the Old Testament, though its history fail to give record of the actual events. The value of the Old Testament is its value for us in religious result ; and not in its historic accuracy.

The outline given us by Prof. Curtis is the trend of Old Testament criticism on its conquering way. Can the religious consciousness adjust itself to this aspect, and suffer no loss of the divinely mandatory ; no weakening of the sense of the religiously obligatory ?

Upon the simple statement of this aspect of religious values in distinction from the historic reality of the record which embodies the value, the difficulties do not seem to be insurmountable. The Christian with the spiritual law in his heart, a law spontaneously obeyed without the stony finger pointing to "Thou shalt," and "Thou shalt not," may find his peace and moral guidance furnished by the morality of Old Testament characters, though those characters be ideal rather than real. But the mass of mankind is not all under grace ; it is still deterred from the doing of evil by law in some threatening form. To such, a change in the historic aspect carries with it a weakening of the morally mandatory. If the story be not history, not reality, the reality of the moral teaching is impaired, and the conscience is made bold to doubt the binding force and absolute right of the moral teaching. God must be nearer to us even than to the childlike, trustful Hebrew ; he must be in our spiritual character and personality rather than immediately behind things and events, if we are to be saved from falling when we deem the record of events untrue, though holding to the truth of the ethical import. But when we have attained that excellence of ethical judgment and that moral stability, Thukydides and Homer may do as much for us as priestly historian and psalmist. Keen religious discernment here precedes the very means designed to create such discernment.

There is indeed an aspect of religious fulness and adequacy in which our spiritual confidence and peace come not from the historic certainty of chronicled events, but from our individual relation to Christ's person and work. There is also measure-

able human imperfection and natural limitation in the reception and transmission of sacred records written by man even under divine superintendence for the guidance of the race in its eternal interests. But the implications of these imperfections with their possibilities are in danger of being made to embrace too liberal a conception of God's mode of spiritual revelation.

There are conceptions entertained in respect of the Bible which are traditional rather than divinely mandatory ; conceptions held as necessarily valid at one point, yet admittedly not requisite at another. Luke's writings are admittedly the product of gathered documents, and yet that men should believe in the documentary composition of Genesis creates dismay. Jesus teaches the same universality of God's mercy in his parable of the Prodigal Son as is taught in the book of the prophet Jonah ; yet Jonah's experience has been deemed necessarily a historic reality, while the prodigal's experience is a parable, a creation of the religious imagination to inculcate a great moral lesson. The food of the prodigal, an accessory in the parable, brought him to repentance, and was the chief material factor in stirring him to a sense of duty ; while the food of the sea-monster has been held a veritable physical reality. When Jesus declares, "I say unto you that Elijah is come already," he employs a literary and spiritual figure of speech ; but when he says, "For even as Jonah became a sign unto the Ninevites, so shall also the Son of man be to this generation," he is regarded as requiring Jonah's literal sojourn in the belly of the sea-monster. But that which seems clear and consistent to the mind of one man may seem a dangerous and unwarrantable innovation of criticism to another. Whose judgment is to decide ? And where shall the line be drawn between the natural and supernatural in God's necessary revelation to man ? There will always be variable degrees and types of the Christian consciousness, and diverse opinions held in respect of the mode of divine revelation which may not destroy an equal type of godly living and an equally resultant noble character in the persons holding opposite views.

The conception, however, of religious education in distinction

from veritable factual history may become prodigal in its application to scriptural interpretation, and finally rule out the supernatural.

The freedom of application may be so great as to invalidate basic historical revelation, and turn religion into pure naturalism.

Excessive spirituality of interpretation may be but blind guidance unaware of the ditch in the unpenetrated way. We had better see God's hand guiding, however anthropomorphic the vision, and believe we see it with our holden eyes, until immaculate discernment can dispense with all real save the spiritually real, than endanger basic principles by mere ethical visions in our clouded world.

II.

GERMAN.

BY PROFESSOR S. GRING HEFELBOWER, A.M.

During recent years Bernhard Weiss, of Berlin, whom Zahn mentioned in conversation as the father among the students of the New Testament, has been bringing out new editions of his commentaries and works on New Testament Theology and Introduction in rapid succession. And there was a general feeling among his fellow specialists that he would devote the remainder of his life to such work, and thus leave all his books thoroughly up to-date, and that he would not attempt anything new. But, contrary to expectations, he has just published a volume on *The Religion of the New Testament*, which stands, as it were, half way between his New Testament Theology and dogmatics. It was reviewed and of course criticized, so far as he dared, by Wendt (liberal) of Jena in a recent number of the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*.

In his text-book of New Testament Theology, Weiss studies the entire religious thought-content of the New Testament in order to distinguish from each other the various forms of teaching and present them objectively in their distinction from each other; in this new book he seeks to present the unity which

lies at the foundation of that diversity, the existence of which is an axiom of the religious life of the Christian (p. 55). The New Testament offers itself as the proof of the revelation of salvation which appeared in Christ, and shows plainly that it is intended to be understood from the premise that it really is such a revelation. The conviction of the correctness of this premise arises from the personal experience of the Christian in his use of the New Testament, when he notes that he lives over again the religious life of which he reads. In this we see the new subjective apologetics, which has been applied by Frank and others to the Christian system of truth, used to excellent advantage in establishing the authority of Scripture. However, in order properly to appreciate Weiss' attitude to the historic proofs of the authority of the books of the New Testament, we must also use with the opening chapters of this book his work on new Testament Introduction, which is on the whole quite conservative.

On page 59 we read: "But if the different forms of teaching of Scripture are only the expressions of the religious consciousness wrought by the same divine revelation of salvation in different individuals and at different stages of development, these different forms of teaching can supplement or define but never contradict each other. A book in which there is expressed a religious consciousness contrary to some other book, cannot be a document of revelation, and should be excluded from the canon." However, he finds in the New Testament certain conceptions that sprung from the thought-world of its writers and the first generation of readers and were not the result of their religious consciousness wrought by the revelation in Christ, which, therefore, need not be considered by the person who seeks the unity that lies at the basis of the diversity in the New Testament teaching (p. 60). For the knowledge of God wrought by revelation in Christ, which effects a new relation to God and a life in harmony with his will, *i. e.*, the religion of the New Testament, must be one. To present this unity, is a necessary service which theological science must render, so that the

Church can use the Holy Scriptures as norm for the development of its doctrine.

From his statements concerning elements in the New Testament that should be considered as the result of the thought environment under which the sacred writers lived and wrote, one would expect that he would find the unity that lies at the basis of all the New Testament revelation by leaving out of consideration many things that we have been accustomed to regard as integral parts of New Testament revelation. But, on the contrary, there is very little that he excludes from his mosaic of New Testament doctrinal statements.

Of course the liberal theologians criticize such conservatism. They claim that the teaching of the other New Testament authors should be set over against that of the Gospel of Jesus. The conclusions of the book are, to say the least, very uncertain, for this constructed unity has a marked complexity about it. But Weiss asserts that the apostolic teaching is a necessary supplement to the life-work of Christ. It was not just His life work, but rather His death that brought salvation. "The fact stands fixed, that the gospel of Christ was preached in such a way as no man will ever again preach it, and under conditions which were most favorable for its acceptance, and yet it did not overcome the world about Jesus, on the contrary, it nailed Him to the cross. If Jesus was the God-sent Bringer of Salvation, and if His work ended with His death, this death must have been intended for the salvation of men and its place in the Gospel, as it has gone out through the world since the days of the apostles, is indisputable. The fact is that this Gospel of the cross has overcome the world, and not a proclamation of the Father-love of God and of the duty of loving our neighbor. Therefore this death must form the center of the apostolic message of salvation, and so it will have to remain in the religion of the New Testament" (p. 182 sq).

Weiss thinks that at present there is special need of just such a work. In the preface he speaks of an awakened seeking and inquiring as to what the Christian religion really is, whether it is the absolute religion, or only one among the many

that have developed in the world's history. To the answering of these questions Weiss brings the results of the life work of a master mind. He does not stop to argue to establish his positions when they differ from those of other men. He has done that elsewhere. Here his method is throughout positive and thetical. This last book can, therefore, be regarded as a resumé of his life's work, and, as such, it is one of the most eloquent witnesses to the Gospel of Christ that has appeared in recent years.

The articles, which Seeberg of Berlin published three years ago in the *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, and which were condensed for the *Quarterly*, XXX, 270 sqq. and 435 sqq., soon appeared as a pamphlet, and passed through three editions within two years. Last year he gave a series of lectures which treated the same period in like manner—the theological, ecclesiastical and in so far as these were influenced by it, the cultural-social history of the XIX century—and published them a few months ago under the title, *The Church of Germany in the XIX Century, an Introduction to the Religious, Theological and Ecclesiastical Problems of the Present*.

As the latter part of this title plainly shows, the book is far more than a resumé of the practical work of the Church of Germany during the last century. In fact, though the historical study of the Church from this view-point is not slighted in any way, the evident purpose of the lectures is to furnish an historico-critical medium for introducing the student to the theological and ecclesiastical problems of the present day.

The occasion for the original articles in the *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift* and for these lectures was, in all probability, the dense ignorance that prevails in Germany, and even more in America, concerning the historical genesis of the theological problems that confront the Church. Clergymen, and even professors of theology, are content to labor with systems or books without a thorough understanding of the historical back-ground in which these systems or books appeared, and not having such an historical understanding of that which they accept, they are not in a position to exercise intelligent criticism, without which

no one can estimate the value of any theology in the light of the needs of the present. We must first know the "whence" if we would know the "whither" of any system. In this book Seeberg seeks to supply this need.

Bratke of Breslau says in his review in the *Theologisches Literaturblatt* that without mentioning all details S. treats everything that is really important. His purpose is to discover the ruling ideas of an age in their relations to that which preceded and that which followed, and thus to present the inner course of history. "But he speaks not only as a careful reporter. Unintentionally the historian becomes a teacher and an instructor, who, advising, warning and fortelling, calls attention to problems and responsibilities of the present"—which personal element enriches rather than detracts from the value of the book. The reviewer adds that the entire volume is in such elegant language and is so far from party prejudice (which many Ritschians and others would scarcely admit) that it captivates the reader as soon as he has begun it, and leaves the impression that, if the higher circles knew and did even only the half of that which the author tells them, the Church would be greatly helped.

Professor Gustav Ecke, formerly of Koenigsberg, now of Bonn, has long been regarded as a most thorough student of theological schools and tendencies of the present. The first edition of his book on *The Theological School of Albrecht Ritschl and the Evangelical Church of the Present*, which appeared about five years ago, was exhausted almost as soon as it left the press, and was in such demand that during the Winter of 1901-2, we watched in vain for a copy at one of the leading second-hand book stores of Leipzig. Ecke's publisher informed the public that a second edition would appear soon, but not until after he had completed another book on which he was then engaged.

His treatment of Ritschianism and its position in the Church is from the conservative view-point. Though Ecke cannot be considered a Lutheran, in the sense in which Luthardt was Lutheran, he is a disciple of Kaehler, of Halle, and is quite an

aggressive opponent of liberalism. His book is more generally recommended by conservative professors to students seeking an acquaintance with Ritschianism than any other book of which we know.

The work, which was promised to the public, and which postponed the second edition of his first book, appeared about two months ago, and, with the volume first mentioned and one that is to follow, forms a series of three volumes. His last book, the middle one of the series, bears the title, *The Evangelical Churches of Germany in the XIX Century: Glimpses into their Inner Life*, and is dated 1904.

The purpose and scope of the book are best expressed in the words of the author at the end of the first chapter, which we quote. After showing clearly, by numerous quotations from men representing almost every shade of theological thought, that there is in the Church of Germany to-day a widespread indifference in religious matters, Prof. Ecke quotes from the Ritschian Ralffs in the *Christliche Welt*, No. 28., 1902, as follows: "The decision as to what type of Christianity will obtain in the future, does not lie in the realm of scientific theology, but on the field of moral action. In the final consideration, nothing convinces save the witness of the Spirit and of power. This is the apologetics that the theologians must present who are conscious that they possess a higher and purer conception of the Christian religion. They will be known by their fruits." Then Ecke continues: "These words express with great exactness the thoughts which encouraged us to take up the present work of scientific investigation. We also believe that we do not err in assuming that these views have the unequivocal approval both of those who are like-minded with him who wrote them, and of all parties who stand for a living Church. Therefore the attempt dare be made to obtain a further understanding on the common basis already present. In order to get an easy way to such an understanding, we examine and seek to answer the questions as to the historical causes of the present indifference to the Church, or even of opposition to the Gospel, that exist within the Protestant Church. Then we turn our attention to a second group of phenomena within

the religious life of to-day, to the forms of 'ceremonial-legalistic' piety of the 'naturalistic conception' of Christianity ; and from this we turn to general estimates of a merely external christianization of the masses, as we find it in the people of the Church of all confessions and of all times. Not until we have set apart the prejudices, which, in part openly, partly in secret, have exercised a disturbing influence on the practical thinking of many modern theologians concerning just this question—Ritschl and his school not excepted—will we be in a position to have an unbiased appreciation of the original, religiously and morally fruitful piety and blooming Christian congregational life in the Evangelical Church of to-day. We note already at this place, that the result of this review will place us before the new and important task of comprehending the sources of blessing, according to their distinguishing peculiarities, from which the glorious life of faith and love in the Evangelical Church of to-day has sprung. In connection with this future investigation, the like weighty question as to the meaning of the 'awakening' and of 'modern pietism' for the religious life of our time will find, as we hope, a satisfactory answer."

Ecke's picture of the Church during the last century and at present is very dark ; some of the details that he gives seem almost impossible. But it is to be viewed rather as a dark back-ground, on which we see some of the most glorious results of the "modern awakening"; and the liberal theology has not been able to produce these results in the past.

Since the publication of Tschackert's *Critical Text* on the Augustana, there has been a new interest in old manuscript copies of our Confession, and at least three new manuscripts have been reported. The last find was made accidentally by Pastor Geo. Berbig, of Schwarzenau in Thuringia, in the ducal family and state archives at Coburg, and the text is reported in full in the *Zeitschrift fuer Kirchengeschichte*, of Oct. 10th, 1903. Though the newly found manuscript adds nothing to that which we know of the exact wording of the original German text, which is lost, it is very valuable, because it confirms throughout the text of *Ansbach* No. 2 and *Nurenberg* manu-

scripts, the latter of which Tschackert made the basis for constructing his German text. From the place of finding, from the style of writing and several other circumstances, Berbig concludes that this was the manuscript copy of Elector John, who was the political leader of the Reformers and whose theologians wrote the Confession. Prof. Brieger, of Leipzig, (editor of the journal in which the text appeared), though not ready to pronounce a final judgment as to the worth of this new find, is disposed to regard it as one of the most valuable manuscripts that we have at present.

ARTICLE VII.

REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK.

Life and Letters of Horace Bushnell. With Portraits and Illustrations. 1903. Price, \$3.00.

Those who have not read the earlier edition of this biographical gem—which for some time has been out of print—will find a treat in this new edition, so attractively published by the Messrs. Scribners. Dr. Bushnell was a man of such strong and gifted personality, his work and movement were so magnetically intellectual and impressive, and his influence so wide and abiding, that his personal history becomes inherently rich in features of interest and attraction. He stands high above the commonplace, in the realm of the rare which exacts attention and becomes instructive. Not without reason has he been spoken of as the greatest man or one of the greatest three men that New England has produced. The author of the memoir, Mary Bushnell Cheney, daughter of Dr. Bushnell, had access to the abundant biographical material and the best friendly co-operation. As there were many aspects of his life and character, it was fitting that the drawing of his memorial picture should be done from various view-points and by many hands, making a more composite work than is commonly the case. The body of the work, by Mrs. Cheney, forming the general history, is enriched and made graphic by large in-weaving of incident, quotation and correspondence, in which the man is seen as he lived and moved in his actual characteristics of thought and work. The two additional chapters, forming portions of the full picture, are from the pens of Dr. Edwin P. Barker, of Hartford, and Miss F. L. Bushnell. The first of these sketches for us Dr. Bushnell's "Ministry at large,"

in those later years when, released from pastoral responsibilities and in comparatively private life, he only occasionally appeared in public relations. The second opens to our view his "closing years," when the agitations and stress of his life were composed, and of which it has been said: "God spared his life till all men were at peace with him."

Whatever may be thought of Dr. Bushnell's interpretation of the atonement—the main feature, probably, of his divergence from the New England theology—there could be no doubt as to his true and ardent piety and splendid Christian personality. He aimed, in deepest sincerity, to reach the true meaning or import of the Scripture teaching. There were features of the Calvinistic New England theology that invited dissent. His reaction from the extreme type of its atonement representations carried him away from the full truth. The moral influence view which he developed was in substance a *part* of the atoning work recognized from the days of Augustine, the manward side; and Dr. Bushnell in his later work, *Forgiveness and Law*, confessed the defect of his earlier presentation in *The Vicarious Sacrifice*, and included the truth of a bearing of the life and sacrifice of Christ in their relations to God himself. "He became conscious of a limitation in his former view, as having regarded too exclusively the manward relations of that great subject, whose two sides he saw to be essential to each other and vitally connected." His *Christian Nurture*, thought to be full of "dangerous tendencies," and suppressed by the Massachusetts Sabbath School Society, was in truth a return to the orthodox teachings of the past, recognizing and emphasizing the organic life of the family and its office of Christian training in the Church, as over against the prevalent extreme individualism. It has approved itself as a bearer of God's truth. Dr. Bushnell's *Sermons for the New Life*, and *Nature and the Supernatural* have added permanent enrichment to theological and philosophical literature.

We quote from Dr. Burton's sermon at his funeral a few sentences intended to interpret his mind and character: "Dr. Bushnell's mind was one of the rarest. What it was in his books, that it was in private, with certain very piquant and unforgettable personal flavors added. It was original almost beyond precedent, in the sense that every thought put forth from it was a pure outgo from its own self. His power to push his mind through hours and hours of continuous labor [*i. e.*, in his weakness under the wasting disease that ended his life] had diminished, of course, but whenever it did stir it was the same teeming and amazing thing as in his prime. It was imaginative, too, even magnificently so at times; indeed it was not possible for him to speak ten sentences on any subject without bringing this great faculty of his into the field, with its illuminations, and ornaments, and outsprings of intuition; and all readers of his books know how all sorts of felicitous analogies were wont to flock in for the illustration

of his theme. It was characteristic of his mind, moreover, that it was independent, courageous always, incisive, imperative, not cumbered by excessive and undigested reading, almost irreverent at times toward mere authority, too little considerate of the wisdom of the past, but truth-loving (intensely so), debative, massive, mobile, impressible to every touch as the sea to the swaying of the winds—a mind so royal in many ways as to waken a never-failing and profound admiration in those who knew him best and were well adjusted to him."

This volume will make its readers acquainted with him.

M. VALENTINE.

The Direct and Fundamental Proofs of the Christian Religion. An Essay in Comparative Apologetics, based upon the Nathaniel William Taylor Lectures for 1903. Given before the Divinity School of Yale University. By George William Knox, Professor of the Philosophy and History of Religion in the Union Theological Seminary, New York. Scribner's Sons, New York, 1903.

This work must be judged of in view of its declared intent. It is not meant to be a restatement and marshalling of the general evidences of the truth of Christianity—a thing that would not be out of place in our day—but specifically to show that even under the new view of the world or universe largely prevalent through the teaching of evolutionist philosophies, a world formed and held under the inviolable continuity of natural law, not a free creation of a transcendent personal Creator, but a monistic or pantheistic evolution of some Absolute Principle, there are still adequate proofs of the divine character of the Christian religion. This is a worthy aim. In adopting it the author, in the Preface, explains his own position: "Apologetics may strengthen the faith of believers who occupy still substantially the old ground, but who desire that objections should be answered, difficulties removed, and the traditional arguments restated. This is its ordinary task. Or it may enter completely into the modern view of the world and show that Christian truth remains. The view-points are so divergent that the two cannot well be united: the first minimizes intellectual changes and takes for granted much which scientific men deny, while the second ignores or surrenders much which traditional theology holds as essential. This essay takes the second course and adopts the modern view of the world. It does not attempt to defend theology, but seeks the principle which is independent of it and yet underlies it. It does not meet the difficulties which are most apparent to the majority of Christians, nor does it adequately represent their faith. No attempt is made to set forth my own faith in its fulness, for all of it, excepting its fundamental principle, is for the purpose of this argument what Professor James calls 'over-beliefs.' My question here is simply, Is the Christian religion true to men who accept unhesitatingly the modern view of the world?"

The author begins with a brief account of what he terms "the classic argument" of past times, as illustrated by Paley and Butler, laying large stress upon the objective evidences from history, miracle, and prophecy, features that since then have been brought under destructive criticism, and instead of being proofs become impediments to faith. He follows with what he regards as the modern view of the world, reached through science and now the characteristic type of philosophic conception. Its determining idea is natural evolution as the explanation of the world as it has come to be and is. It postulates as its working principle and test of all truth the inviolable continuity of natural law. The conception of the supernatural in the history of the world is excluded. "When God is accepted by the reason it is no longer the theocratic God before and beyond the world and only a little larger than the angels, but the theanthropic God, around and within," *i. e.*, a monistic or pantheistic evolution. The principle of evolution is made the test of truth not only in nature, but in man, and society, and history. The conclusion is: "It follows that the special proofs offered for the Christian religion as God's revelation lose their force."

After defining religion in its generic sense, and through some comparative studies in ethnic religions, showing some truths naturally reached by some of them, the author gives us what he regards as the adequate and conclusive proofs of the divine character of Christianity. "Its direct and fundamental proofs are that it satisfies our religious needs, and that it may be embodied in all the varied activities of men." Unfolding along this line, he explains the chief distinct feature of its thus meeting all human need, *first*, in "the realm of ethics," where its unequaled teaching and power are illustrated in its principle of self-sacrificing love, a principle transcending nature—"the opposite of the kingdom of nature described as a desperate struggle for existence"—"Christlike," showing itself divinely supreme. *Secondly*, in the sphere of religion, in meeting man's religious nature through its disclosure of the character of the Supreme Being who is to be worshipped. This revelation is in Jesus Christ. "So the direct and fundamental proof of Christianity as religion can be only in the life and death of Jesus Christ as the revelation of the Christian God." Worship, service and consequent spiritual likeness to Him meets all religious needs. Our author adds yet that Christianity is the "absolute religion" as covering the truth sought in all, containing in its principles the elements of all progress and the establishment of the kingdom of God.

By reminding of these proofs and placing emphasis on them, Professor Knox has done good service. We think he might have done better. He concedes too much, and unnecessarily, to the dogmatics of evolutionist speculation and its supposed destructive results in the overthrow of the Biblical theistic view and its claim of supernatural revelation. In "adopting the modern view of the world" as his position in

argument, and surrendering as "over-beliefs" so much of what has been held as essential in Christianity, his treatment carries a skeptical tendency as well as, or more than, assurance to faith. Its preservation of Christianity becomes too much a surrender of its content, an abandonment of its cardinal and constituent essence. Its apologetic service is diminished by its immense and needless concessions to unbelief.

M. VALENTINE

Old Testament History. By Henry Preserved Smith, D D., Professor of Biblical History and Interpretation in Amherst College. Pp. xxv and 512. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

Introductions to the Old Testament and Histories of the People of Israel are multiplying. The reason for this is not hard to find. On the first page of the Preface to the work under review we are told that "Every new advance in criticism involves the re-writing of history." Which means, we suppose, so far as the Old Testament is concerned, that whenever a critic thinks he has found a new legend or myth, or evidence of additional sub-documents, interpolations, redactors or compilers, he must forthwith write a new history that shall embody these latest discoveries.

The author of this history is well known as a man of profound scholarship. He brings vast stores of learning to his task. His style is clear, his tone reverent. Many of the historical portions of the Old Testament grow singularly real and vivid under the touch of his graceful pen. These facts and others that might be mentioned impart a peculiar interest and value to this volume. On the other hand, the deductions and conclusions which are presented with a great show of assurance, though differing so widely from the acknowledged faith of the Christian Church, are not a series of truths founded upon incontestable proof, but the product of an untried, yet elaborately conceived, hypothesis, and will therefore be of little account to a devout mind in making up a judgment respecting the origin and credibility of the Sacred Scriptures.

The book is written from the negative standpoint of the Higher Criticism: it is destructive rather than constructive in its spirit and tendency. Like all works from the radical wing of the critical school, it is altogether revolutionary; it recasts Old Testament history, thrusts out with remorseless hand old and cherished beliefs, erases the touching events on which, as on beautiful pictures, Christians have been gazing with affectionate reverence during past ages, is antagonistic to the fact of a divine and progressive revelation and leaves us without a trustworthy guide for faith and practice.

That this is not an overstatement of the case we will give an extract and let our readers be the judge. In summing up the results of his investigation into the nature and motive of the exodus, the author says:

"There may have been an Israelite clan that sojourned in Egypt. Its exodus was not improbably due to a religious leader. Under this religious leader the people entered into covenant with other desert-dwelling clans at Kadesh. The God who sanctioned the alliance and who became a party to it was Yahweh, the Storm-God of Sinai." In this manner the second book of the Pentateuch is disposed of. It is however in the book of Genesis that the Higher Criticism performs its most wonderful feats. Its earlier chapters are peculiarly fitted for the exhibition of grotesque theories. For instance, Dr. Smith assures us that the Creation and Deluge stories are of undoubted Babylonian origin. If we remember rightly, we have had similar assurances given us from Delitsch's pen in *Babel und Bibel*. We are further informed that the story of the Fall was invented by a late writer to account for the hard lot of the peasant, and that the Tower of Babel with its confusion of tongues, was improvised to explain to inquiring minds of a subsequent age the existence of the various languages. It is further asserted that there were no such men as the Patriarchs. "The individuals, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are eponyms—personifications of clans, tribes or ethnological groups—and they are nothing more." Thus with one stroke of the pen the call of Abraham, the solemn covenant which God made with him, and the sublime promises to his posterity, are crossed out.

We glanced into the chapter which gives an account of the Book of Daniel. We are informed that it was composed B C. 165. "The author writes under the name of some hero of antiquity. He transports himself in imagination to the alleged writer's time, and makes him see in vision that which is to come to pass. These visions simply clothe history in the form of prediction till they reach the time of the real author." Poor Daniel! How often we have admired the loftiness of purpose and daring courage of this brave Hebrew captive! But we were mistaken; he was not and is not, for the critics took him!

We believe and teach that when God had created man, he also made known to him his will and purpose, that his revelation was progressive, adapted to the ability of man to receive it, that in the course of time he selected one man, and through him a people, which he made the depository of his truth, that he spoke to this people by the mouth of prophet and seer, and in the fulness of time by his own Son, and that he guarded and preserved his truth to the extent that man should always possess sufficient light for intelligent belief and righteous living. Any other view must, it seems to us, be dishonoring to God and must impugn his wisdom and goodness.

The critical theory, as unfolded in the volume before us, teaches and would have us believe that God has revealed himself, but his revelation of him, contained in what is termed the Old Testament, has been so perverted and corrupted, so permeated with myth and legend and error,

by men who wrote fraudulently, under false names or from unworthy motives, that the ripest scholarship of the age has been compelled to delve and dig for half a century and more, by methods so complicated as to bewilder the ordinary mind, in order to extract the golden grain of truth from the superimposed mass of rubbish. And even at this late day these scholars are by no means unanimous in their verdict as to what is truth and what is error. Can such a theory be correct? Can its conclusions be trustworthy? Can it commend itself to the sober judgment of the average man?

We have but one request to make of the men who propound this theory: As they have deprived us of that which we love and treasure as God's Word, that which is our comfort and stay in the hour of trial, will they kindly furnish us with a Bible so that we may have something that will serve as an infallible guide for the Christian's life here and hereafter. We do not promise to accept this man-made Bible, but we will preserve it as a relic of rationalistic criticism.

T. C. BILLHEIMER.

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND CO.

Aids to the Study of Dante. By Charles Allen Dinsmore. (8 $\frac{1}{2}$ x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$; pp. xv. 435.)

Of the need of "aids" to the student of Dante there will be no question. We are more remote in our habits of thought from this mediaeval Christian poet than we are from the classical pagan poets of the Augustan or Homeric periods, three or four times as distant in the number of centuries.

Mr. Dinsmore's service in this book is chiefly that of an editor putting together the most notable utterances of others about the poet's life and work, with a few brief essays of his own and comments in occasional foot notes. The Lives of Dante by Boccaccio and Leonardo Bruni are furnished in translation. Several portraits of Dante are given in connection with a chapter on his personal appearance. But selected sections from such eminent critics as Dean Church, Charles Eliot Norton, Adolph Gaspary, Karl Witte, P. H. Wicksteed, J. R. Lowell and others make up the body of the work and are introduced in an orderly succession treating of the times of Dante, his biography, the *Vita Nuova* and minor works, the *Divina Commedia* and its interpretation. For the student of Dante the latter half of the book is especially helpful. The diagrams of the complex conception of the *Inferno*, the *Purgatorio* and the *Paradiso* are like a map of an unknown country and are greatly illuminating. The names of the authors of the various sections are a sufficient guarantee of excellent substance and high literary quality.

J. A. HIMES.

THE CHRISTIAN PUBLISHING CO., ST. LOUIS.

An Endeavorer's Working Journey Around the World. By John F. Anderson. With an Introduction by Robert J. Burdette. Pp. 313.

In its general make-up this is an attractive volume. The portrait of the young author at the front of the book leads one to expect something stirring in its contents, and the faithful reader is not disappointed. It is an almost remarkable history of the achievement of a desire, cherished from childhood to manhood, to travel round the world. Without means, a young Christian, a member of the Christian Endeavor Society of Vacaville, California, the young man learns a trade which is to serve as his capital, and with an able body and a staunch and chaste Christian heart and ready hands, sets out to see the world. He sees it from the standpoint of the workman, and one loses interest in the places that he sees while they follow the steadfast progress of the young man on his journey and his straightforward, but often difficult, methods of procedure. But one is all the time sure of his success, for in the short preface he says: "After treading the soil of every State in my own Country, I left New York with eight dollars in my pocket, belted the sphere with my footprints and arrived at San Francisco with about sixty-five dollars."

Concerning the aim of his journey he says in the preface: "The average tourist has told us much of the palaces of royalty and the salons of art centres. What I wanted to know was what the lower caste of India ate for breakfast, the sort of carpets the peasantry of France had on the front room floor, how hard a German laborer had to work to provide for his large family, whether the sentiment of the Bedouin was a fable, and the possible profits of the farmer in the Holy Land. Books had not told me these things. Lecturers had given information about the leaning tower of Pisa, but had not told me what would be necessary for an American to do in order to shift for himself in the Philippines. I went to the old countries far more anxious to see the wage earners of Italy and Switzerland and China than to behold a string of Princes or to marvel at the architecture of European capitals."

In his "Introduction," Dr. Burdette says: "More than once I met him (Mr. Anderson) on his journeys in the Orient. A good type of the young American, independent, with never the slightest trace of swagger; wearing his poverty with manly dignity, rich in his unconsciousness of it; at ease with guests in a hotel parlor; equally at ease with the same gentlemanly demeanor, when these acquaintances rolled or galloped past him as he trudged alone on carriage road or bridle trail. Proffers of financial assistance he declined by showing his hands. These and his brains won for him day by day, bread for eating, money for his journey, a tent or roof to cover his head at night. And if these failed, he slept as did the Patriarch pillow'd on stone and sheltered by the skies."

The book is a record of pluck, wit, tact and stern moral integrity that every Christian Endeavorer should read.

M. E. RICHARD.

GINN AND COMPANY.

Discourses on War. By William Ellery Channing, with an Introduction by Edwin D. Mead (8x5½; pp. lxi. 229.)

The name of Channing is a guarantee both of the literary quality and of the moral soundness of these discourses written from sixty to seventy years ago. We find in them nothing of the doctrine so constantly assumed at the present day that war is a test of courage and endurance in which both parties may win glory and neither may be censurable provided the rules of the game are observed. "A nation's honor may require its citizens to engage in war; but it requires them to engage in it wisely—with a full consciousness of rectitude and with unfeigned sorrow. * * * A human being cannot be valued by silver and gold, and in consequence a nation can never be authorized to sacrifice thousands of lives for the mere recovery of property, of which it has been spoiled * * * To protect a state from the spirit of violence and unprincipled aggression is the duty of rules; and protection may be found only in war." Within the range of such sane principles the moral argument against war is presented in the most earnest and convincing manner. In the Introduction Mr. Mead turns it against the present practice of England and America (pp. xii. xiii.) in subduing and reducing to order the wild and turbulent peoples of the world. We may fairly question, however, whether there is not here a balance in favor of the saving of life and a positive increase of happiness by the vigorous display of the strong hand by civilized states. Whatever may be the conclusion as to this, no one can doubt the healthful influence of such a book at a time when there seems to be a renewal of unauthorized violence and brutality within the limits of the nations themselves. When the glory of war shall vanish the attractiveness of smaller revenges must also fade.

J. A. HIMES.

GERMAN LITERARY BOARD, BURLINGTON, IOWA.

Der Zionsbote Christlicher Volks Kalendar.

In addition to the matter usually found in such publications, this Almanac contains Lists of Daily Scripture Readings, a History of the Ger. Evang. Luth Synod of Nebraska, 1890-1903, Biographical Sketches of Franke and Muhlenberg, and a Clerical Register of the Gen. Synod.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, COLUMBUS, O.

Evangelical Lutheran Almanac, and Evangelisch Lutherischer Kalender.

These Almanacs are full of valuable statistics, viz.: Lutheran population of the World, Lutheran Synods in North America, General Church Register, etc., etc.

T. C. BILLHEIMER.

GENERAL COUNCIL PUBLICATION HOUSE, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Bible Geography. Third Grade Text Book for Intermediate Sunday Schools. By Theodore E. Schmauk. Cloth 4to. Pp. 208. Price \$1.25.

The Rev. Dr. Schmauk, Editor of the Lutheran Lesson Series for the General Council, has prepared for Sunday schools a work of value and merit. In the fifty-two chapters of the *Bible Geography* arranged for the year, the history, times, customs, scenery, and government of Bible lands and peoples are succinctly and strikingly presented. The exclusion of the Bible from public school instruction makes imperative a form of religious instruction of equal merit with methods of secular instruction and education.

It may seem unspiritual to some to give so much time to historical study for the end of religious education; but the Bible school is not the Catechetical Class, and the mind of youth is most impressed not by the pietistic, but by the historic and factual elements of religious study. Education in the facts of religion will promote ripest religion. The attempt to educate the mind in the sentimental operation of the soul in the experience called religious, before the facts of Biblical truth have been grasped, produces an emotional and evanescent experience. The eye as well as the ear is a ready avenue for lasting and comprehensive impressions. The varied and numerous illustrations on every page of the geography delineating scenery and customs, and unveiling to the mind the occasions which form the background of Biblical narratives, furnish a rich store of suggestion to the pupil. The book deserves a wide use.

M. COOVER.

PERRY MASON COMPANY, 201 COLUMBUS AVE., BOSTON.

We have had occasion, time and again, to call the attention of our readers to the merits of the *Youth's Companion*, published by the Perry Mason Company, of Boston, Mass. Those merits are still as marked as ever, and we not only take back nothing we have said hitherto, but wish to emphasize it. Those having charge of that paper are fully maintaining its high standard, and more. They are making it every year more acceptable to its hundreds of thousands of readers.

The moral tone of the *Companion* is excellent and every parent that is concerned on this point can feel that his son or daughter is reading a safe paper. Nothing of questionable morality will be found on its pages. Then, too, among its contributors will be found some of the leading statesmen and literary men of our country. While its pages are full of interest, they are full also of such material as will benefit the reader. Coming as it does every week, it is no small factor in the education of the boy or girl who is fortunate enough to be on its mailing list.

A striking proof of the merits of this paper is the hold it has on its readers. The bright boy that begins reading it will look eagerly for it

week after week, and his interest will not cease on reaching manhood. The sum of \$1.75 invested in the *Companion* each year is one of the best investments for the child that can be made.

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, ST. LOUIS, MO.

Life of Luther, etc. By Gustav Just. Translated. Pp. 103.

Our estimate of the German original of this book was expressed in last year's volume of the QUARTERLY. It has great merits as a book of instruction for the young; but it also has defects. We regret that the author has not seen fit to consult the sources of history; but has chosen rather the office of compiler. History should be written only after careful examination of its sources. Then it is likely to be *History*, not party declamation. The inculcation of truth, and not the defense of a dogmatic thesis, should inspire the writer on historical subjects. The embellishments of rhetoric only weaken and degrade the life of Luther, and obscure the glory of the Reformation.

J. W. RICHARD.

ATLANTIC MONTHLY, BOSTON, MASS.

The "toast-master" of the *January Atlantic* opens the feast with a genial talk on Catering for the Public,—the tasks and troubles of a literary purveyor. Thomas Wentworth Higginson resumes his reminiscent papers with a characteristic account of The Sunny Side of the Transcendental Period full of entertaining description and anecdote.

The first of several papers on a novel subject, some phases of contemporary advertising, is furnished by Professor Walter D. Scott who writes on The Psychology of Advertising. Jack London contributes an entertaining paper on The Scab in his various relations, and goes to prove that everybody, all the world, is a scab or non-scab at intervals, or alternately, as circumstances may induce. Edwin Burritt Smith discusses Street Railway Legislation in Illinois, a topic of great importance. Prof. T. J. J. See treats and explains The Blue Color of the Sky, its cause and character. Mrs. Elizabeth W. H. Wright furnishes an interesting paper on Singapore and R. Brimley Johnson sends a valuable letter from London upon the Issue of Protection. Robert Herrick begins a strong and imaginative serial novel, *The Common Lot*; the scene laid in Chicago. Complete short stories are: *Bachelor's Fancy* by Alice Brown, *Roxella's Prisoner* by Harriet Nash and *The New Hunting* by Kate Milner Rabb.

Biographical and literary essays and reviews are: *Morley's Gladstone* by Rollo Ogden; *Laura Bridgman* by Prof. William James; *some Nineteenth-Century Americans* by M. A. DeWolf Howe; *The Meaning of Rhode Island* by G. P. Winship, *Two Books about New England, Platonic Poetry* by F. G. and *Books New and Old*.

Poems are contributed by Henry Van Dyke, Mabel Earle, and M. Glennah, and the Contributors' Club is entertaining and amusing.